

JPRS-UIA-86-036

31 JULY 1986

USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

No 2, MAR-APR 1986

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

31 JULY 1986

USSR REPORT
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD
No 2, MAR-APR 1986

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language journal RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, published six times a year in Moscow by the Institute of the International Workers' Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences,

CONTENTS

Author Information (p 192).....	1
Zagladin on Contradictions, Processes of Social Development (pp 3-16) (V. V. Zagladin).....	2
Journal Cites New CPSU Program, Analyzes Working Class Role (pp 17-33) (T. T. Timofeyev).....	18
New Phase of Technological Revolution and Social Polarization of Capitalist Society (pp 34-48) (N. P. Ivanov) (not translated)	
Trends, Future Political Development of South America Viewed (pp 49-60) (S. I. Semenov).....	34
Heightened Exploitation of Manpower in Contemporary Capitalist Society (pp 61-75) (S. A. Yershov) (not translated)	
Roundtable: Scientific, Technical Revolution, Unemployment (pp 76-88)....	49
Capitalism, Structural Change and Class Struggle on the Threshold of the 21st Century (pp 89-97) (A. A. Galkin) (not translated)	
State-Monopolist Capitalism: New Trends and Contradictions (pp 98-101) (R. M. Entov) (not translated)	
People's Republic of Bulgaria: Heroes of Socialist Labor (Socio- Psychological Features) (pp 102-111) (Yu. Aroyo) (not translated)	

CONTENTS (Continued)

French Labor Unions Face Structural Crisis (pp 112-123) (N. Yu. Lapina) (not translated)	
In the Struggle for Labor Interests (pp 124-132) (I. L. Nedyak) (not translated)	
Central Labor Organizations in Ecuadorean Politics (pp 133-144) (S. B. Radkevich) (not translated)	
'Social Character' of Hunger Problem, Its Solution Stressed (pp 145-155) (L. A. Knyazhinskaya).....	50
The Origins of May Day (pp 156-169) (S. M. Askoldova) (not translated)	
Liberation, Post-War 'Democratization' of East Europe Noted (pp 170-178) (I. S. Yazhborovskaya).....	63
Book Reviews	
Review of 'The Main Source of Our Strength' by A. V. Smirnov (pp 179-181) (A. M. Katsva) (not translated)	
Three Books on Iran's History, Revolution, Regime Reviewed (pp 182-185) (N. A. Kuznetsova).....	80
Review of 'The Poverty of Millions' by N. F. Rydvanov (pp 185-187) (E. P. Pletnev) (not translated)	
Monograph on Spanish, Portuguese Socialist Parties Reviewed (pp 187-190) (V. M. Yakushchik).....	86
Contents in English (p 191) (not translated)	

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY
WORLD
No 2, March-April 1986

Russian title : RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : I. K. Pantin

Publishing House : Izdatelstvo "Progress"

Place of publication : Moscow

Date of publication : March-April 1986

Signed to press : 12 March 1986

Copies : 9,928

COPYRIGHT : "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir",
1986

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) p 192

[Text] Zagladin, Vadim Valentinovich--doctor of philosophy and professor.

Timofeyev, Timur Timofeyevich--corresponding member of USSR Academy of Sciences and director of IMRD [Institute of International Workers Movement], USSR Academy of Sciences.

Yershov, Stal Aleksandrovich--doctor of historical sciences, professor and sector head at IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences.

Galkin, Aleksandr Abramovich--doctor of historical sciences, professor and department head at IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences.

Aroyo, Yuriy--candidate of economic sciences and academic secretary of Institute of Trade Union Affairs imeni G. Dimitrov, Bulgaria.

Lapina, Natalya Yuryevna--candidate of historical sciences and researcher at INION [Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences], USSR Academy of Sciences.

Nedyak, Irina Leonidovna--graduate student at IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences.

Radkevich, Stanislav Borisovich--graduate student at CPSU Central Committee Institute of Social Sciences.

Knyazhinskaya, Larisa Aleksandrovna--doctor of economic sciences and senior researcher at IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences.

Askoldova, Svetlana Mikhaylovna--doctor of historical sciences and senior researcher at IVI [General History Institute], USSR Academy of Sciences.

Yazhborovskaya, Inessa Sergeyevna--doctor of historical sciences and senior researcher at IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

8588

CSO: 1807/287

ZAGLADIN ON CONTRADICTIONS, PROCESSES OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 3-16

[Article by V. V. Zagladin: "Contradictions of World Development and Social Progress"; passages rendered in all capital letters printed in boldface in source]

[Text] "The experience of the USSR and other socialist countries cogently demonstrates the indisputable socio-economic, political, ideological and moral advantages of the new society as a level of human progress superior to capitalism, and provides answers to questions that the bourgeois system is incapable of answering" ("CFSU Program. New Edition").

Any phenomenon, in nature or society, arises under the influence of certain contradictions or as a result of their resolution. At the same time, it comes into being with its own features and new contradictions, which generate its further development. The consideration of these contradictions, and thorough consideration, is a necessary prerequisite for a correct understanding of the course of events, its successful prediction and the consequent development of an effective policy meeting the requirements of society.

A comparison of the current phase of world history with preceding periods points up its truly rapid progress today and, at the same time, its exceptionally complex and contradictory nature. On the one hand, the universal, integral and genuinely international nature of human existence is becoming increasingly evident. On the other, there is the more pronounced differentiation of sociopolitical processes and their richness and diversity. The actual contradictions of contemporary world development lie at the basis of each. As the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress point out, the study of the progress of this development and the problems it engenders is one of the important tasks of Soviet science.

The existence of human society, based on the world's material unity and the unity of humankind as a species, OBJECTIVELY had, in K. Marx' words, a "worldwide historical nature" from the very beginning. IN FACT, or in practice, it was by no means immediately so. "World history," K. Marx pointed

out, "has not always existed; history as world history is a result."¹ The establishment of the history of mankind as the truly worldwide WORLD DEVELOPMENT of mankind was the result of the resolution of contradictions between the objective unity of mankind's existence and the local nature of its existence in its initial stages. Of course, certain prerequisites were needed for the progress of this establishment. They were created by the evolution of society's productive forces. This took a long time. It was not until the capitalist phase that productive forces acquired the characteristics and scales allowing for the creation of a world market and then a world (capitalist) economy. The process of the internationalization of the economic, and also the political and spiritual, life of mankind developed on this basis.²

After it became truly worldwide, the process of historical development was immediately burdened by a number of internal contradictions. The main contradiction of capitalism as a social system is the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation. It is manifest in the social sphere as antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These two contradictions, which are closely connected, are characteristic OF THE ENTIRE capitalist structure--in other words, of each capitalist country and the entire world capitalist system. They were both manifest as far back as the 19th century: first in the form of economic crises affecting the economies of all the main capitalist countries, and then in the form of international demonstrations by the proletariat and the movement for proletarian solidarity, reflected specifically in the activities of the First and Second Internationals.

At that time, however, crises inflicting heavy losses on the bourgeoisie did not have the profound social consequences they had later. Furthermore, the proletarian movement was not developed enough to have any perceptible effect on the directions and nature of world development. The antagonism between the peoples of the colonies and the capital of the mother countries was just gathering momentum. During this period, rivalry between individual capitalist countries and groups of countries was the contradiction determining the features of world development and its directions and nature.

The world picture changed subsequently in connection with changes in these contradictions, their intensification and exacerbation or their partial resolution (which always gave rise to new contradictions or modified the old ones). In turn, the contradictions of world development, their structure and nature underwent changes. For example, after capitalism entered the phase of imperialism, the competitive struggle of monopolist capital in the world arena acquired new intensity and new forms. Inter-imperialist skirmishes in the world arena were henceforth fought not only on the level of government, in the form of clashes between various imperialist countries in competition for markets and sources of raw materials, and for the territorial redistribution of spheres of influence, but also on the level of confrontations between monopolies and their associations, which were striving for the economic partition of the world. The conflict between the mother countries and colonies also became more dynamic. It began to take the form of powerful revolutionary demonstrations by colonies and their populations (especially after the Russian Revolution of 1905-1907). Finally, the conflict between the bourgeoisie and

the proletariat became a real factor of world development. It began to advance to the forefront as antagonism between "international amalgamated capital and the international workers movement."³

All of these contradictions, in spite of their heterogeneity, comprised a unified system. The capitalist production relations then prevailing in the world were their system-forming element during the period of the capitalist domination of free competition and the initial period of capitalism's existence (prior to 1917). The contradictions of world development continued to change during the period following Great October. The changes of this period were substantive and qualitative changes caused by the beginning of a new historical era--the era of mankind's gradual transition from capitalism to socialism.

"The liberation revolutions begun by Great October determined the characteristics of the 20th century," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress says. "Regardless of how significant scientific and technical achievements might be and how strongly society might be influenced by rapid scientific and technical progress, only the social and spiritual emancipation of mankind can make it truly free. And no matter what kind of difficulties the old world causes, objective or artificial, the course of history is irreversible."

The victory of October signified nothing other than the resolution of the main contradiction of the capitalist order in Russia. But after being resolved in a single country, it gave rise to a new contradiction, which immediately took on worldwide, international features--the contradiction between the two social systems: socialist and capitalist. The system-forming element of the contradictions of world development then became "the competition between two methods, two structures and two economies--communist and capitalist."⁴ The Great October Socialist Revolution was "A CRUCIAL EVENT IN WORLD HISTORY, DETERMINING THE GENERAL DIRECTION AND BASIC TENDENCIES OF WORLD DEVELOPMENT."⁵ The "competition" between the two systems has had an increasing effect on all other contradictions in the world and on their dynamics.

The main social contradiction of the bourgeois world--between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--also took a different form after October. The most important point is that the basic contradiction of our age--between socialism and capitalism--resulted from the resolution of the basic social contradiction of capitalism, first in our country and then in other countries that chose the socialist path. The connection between these two contradictions is a constant and integral factor of their dynamics: They affect each other. Besides this, the growth of socialism is having an increasing effect on the contradiction between labor and capital in the non-socialist world.

The victory of socialism in our country made the working class the center of the contemporary age. The antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--the basic contradiction OBJECTIVELY inherent in the entire world capitalist system--has thereby become its basic social antagonism in fact, in real sociopolitical practice. This is having an increasingly perceptible effect on the general course of events in the capitalist world.

The successes of socialism are strengthening the position of the working class in the non-socialist world and promoting its growing awareness that the replacement of capitalism by socialism (in one form or another and at one pace or another) is a realistic goal and that the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is a historically determined cause of great promise for laborers. "Living examples and actual progress in a single country have a greater effect on the laboring masses in all countries than any kind of proclamation or conference," V. I. Lenin wrote.⁶

At the same time, the growth of socialism inevitably weakens capital's position in confrontations with labor. After October the bourgeoisie and its ideologists lost the advantage of being able to assert that the capitalist system is eternal and unshakeable and that it would be impossible to change social systems based on the supremacy of "sacred" private ownership. The course of history then showed that socialism was capable of actually solving the fundamental problems of the laboring public.

The development of the communist movement--the movement organically combining revolutionary theory with the struggle of the working class on an international scale, was a reflection of the new features acquired in post-October years by the contradiction between labor and capital and between the working class and the bourgeoisie on the international level. The contradiction between mother countries and colonies also acquired new characteristics under the influence of the basic contradiction of the age. October initiated the collapse of imperialism's colonial system and the gradual liberation of oppressed people from colonial domination. The struggle for national liberation and the struggle for social liberation also began to converge.

Of course, inter-imperialist contradictions continued to exist and develop after October. Moreover, they were sometimes much more acute than before. Their dynamics, however, were modified by the effects of the main contradiction of the age. Faced with the increasing strength of socialism, imperialist forces had to sometimes forget their internal discord in order to pool their efforts in the struggle against socialism and the worldwide working class. A striking example of this was seen on the eve of World War II, when the class strategy of imperialism in "advanced" countries consisted of combining the desire to step up the struggle against rivals with attempts to join them in the struggle against socialism and the workers movement. They tried to resolve their inter-imperialist contradictions at the expense of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the bourgeoisie of "democratic" countries was prepared to make deals with fascist rivals, to the point of treason, in order to stifle the growing proletarian movement for social liberation. It would be impossible to understand the conflicting events that occurred before and during World War II without a consideration of these circumstances.

Finally, a contradiction of a universal nature, the contradiction between imperialism and the popular masses of all countries on the issue of war and peace, which was first evident during World War I, acquired substantial significance after October. World War I, which inflicted tragedy and suffering on the masses, showed that this issue was a fundamental one for all mankind. During the war years and, in particular, during the period between the wars

under the influence of October, demonstrations by the masses against the threat of war and militarism were extremely active and sizeable. V. I. Lenin noted that the desire of people for peace ceased to be a matter of "vague and impotent anticipation" and became "a clear and distinct political program and an effective struggle by millions."⁷

It can be said that the result was a new complex system of contradictions of world development that is essentially still in existence. It is clear from the previous discussion that this is a matter of the "coexistence" and intermingling of four types of contradictions. FIRST OF ALL, there are the class-related antagonistic contradictions of world development--that is, primarily contradictions between socialism and capitalism and between labor and capital on the global scale. SECONDLY, there are contradictions of a general democratic nature (for instance, between monopolies and colonial countries and between the people of the countries enslaved by imperialism and monopolist capital). THIRDLY, there are contradictions of a general human nature, which are also essentially of a social nature and which reflect the insurmountable antagonism between the interests of monopolist capital and the interests of mankind as a species. The conflict over the issue of war and peace was originally part of this group of contradictions. FOURTHLY, and finally, there are inter-imperialist contradictions--that is, essentially intra-class contradictions.

This system continued to develop after World War II, especially in the last quarter of a century. In general, it is distinguished by three features:

The enrichment of the existing system of contradictions, including the appearance of new elements within the framework of each of the four types mentioned;

The combination and convergence of several of the contradictions of this system, reflecting, in K. Marx' words, "worldwide relations based on the interdependence of all mankind."⁸

Finally, the significant intensification of the "old" and the "new" contradictions of world development, playing the major role in the acceleration of social progress and in the complication of the entire process of its development.

The main contradiction of our age--between socialism and capitalism--has undergone the greatest development and intensification in the past decade. This applies to the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the matter.

On the quantitative level, socialism now represents almost one-third of mankind. Its economic possibilities and achievements have turned it into the most dynamically developing part of today's world. On the level of military strategy, the socialist community achieved parity with the main group of imperialist powers, the NATO bloc, in the 1970's. These quantitative changes also have qualitative consequences. Their essence is that socialism, as V. I. Lenin predicted, is gradually becoming the decisive factor in world history.

At the same time, world capitalism, which entered a phase of general crisis encompassing all spheres of its social existence as a result of World War I and the October Revolution, is still a strong and dangerous social system, even past its zenith. It tries to maneuver, modifying certain methods and modes of its class domination, but all of the maneuvers of contemporary capitalism "cannot and will not repeal the laws of its development."⁹ "The problems and crises of the capitalist world arise from deep within this world and represent a natural result of the internal antagonistic contradictions of the old society. In this sense, capitalism negates itself as it develops," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Congress notes. "Unable to cope with the exacerbation of problems during the phase of capitalism's decline, ruling circles in imperialist countries are resorting to means and methods that are indisputably incapable of saving a society doomed by history itself."

This is precisely the reason for the current extraordinary exacerbation of the contradiction between the two systems. "The more severely the course of historical development gnaws away at imperialism's positions, the more hostile to the public interest the policy of its most reactionary forces becomes. Imperialism is fiercely resisting social progress and attempting to halt the course of history, undermine socialism's influence and take social revenge on a worldwide scale. The imperialist powers are seeking to coordinate their economic, political and ideological strategy and create a common front of struggle against socialism and all revolutionary liberation movements.

"Imperialism does not want to accept the political realities of today's world. Ignoring the wishes of sovereign peoples, it seeks to deprive them of the right to choose their own path of development and threatens their security. This is the main reason for the outbreak of conflicts in various parts of the world."¹⁰

The depth and severity of the basic contradiction of the age reflects the fact that the transition from capitalism to socialism is not an ordinary historical move from one structure to another. This is a "dual" shift: from a lower social system to a higher one, and from the age of the supremacy of private ownership to an age of the total liberation of mankind from all forms of social oppression, and all forms of oppression in general. This is the reason for the old society's bitter opposition to forces for social progress.

The evolution--quantitative and qualitative--of the contradiction between socialism and capitalism obviously did not abolish the basic social contradiction of the capitalist world (between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat) and even promoted its further intensification. The socioeconomic changes in capitalist society in connection with the consequences of the technological revolution and the intense socialization of production and labor gave it additional intensity (and severity). These changes primarily affected the working class, which grew numerically (to the point of becoming the majority of the population in Europe, America, Japan and the most highly developed Latin American countries). The proletariat now exists and operates in all spheres of public life--industrial and agricultural production, intellectual activity, the service sector and the commercial-clerical sphere. This means that its potential ability to affect the course of history is growing stronger. However,

precisely due to the increased numerical strength of the working class and the inclusion of new detachments in this class, it has undergone internal differentiation, it has acquired more strata, and the strata closest to the bourgeoisie have become the largest (often hampering the identification of the revolutionary potential of the proletariat as an entire class).

Changes have also affected the other pole of capitalist society--the bourgeois class. Here, on the contrary, it is a matter of numerical reduction and of the advancement of, on the one hand, an increasingly small "upper" substratum, the monopolist oligarchy, and, on the other, many small businessmen, who are officially independent but are actually completely dependent on the big "bosses" and are balancing on the brink of ruin.

Under the conditions of the intermingling of economic and structural crises and the progressive growth of unemployment, which is turning a large part of the working population (more than 10 percent!) into "social outcasts" without any prospects and without any social or moral stability, the social panorama of contemporary capitalism is still changing. The social contradictions inherent in it are growing more pronounced, although they do not always appear as severe on the surface (a result of the well-known tendency of consciousness to lag behind existence and of the subjective factor of social change to develop less rapidly than social antagonisms).

As stated before, in the age of imperialism the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is essentially becoming international. This process has recently entered a new phase of development and is now manifest in increasingly diverse forms.

Above all, there is the continuous growth of the working class--in the former colonies as well as in the socialist and developed capitalist countries. K. Marx once said that in principle the existence of a proletariat is possible only "in the worldwide historical context." The working class today does exist on the international, "worldwide historical" scale. The entire world has become the sphere of its social activity. Consequently, the entire world has also ACTUALLY become, subjectively as well as objectively, a sphere influenced by the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Furthermore, the development of the international workers movement, especially the growth of the world communist movement, the growing membership of the labor federations operating on virtually all continents and the increasing activity of the Socialist International, has signified the actual internationalization of the working class' struggle. In turn, however, the monopolist bourgeoisie is also striving (and more and more actively) to unite its efforts against the proletariat.

A new step in the actual internationalization of the class struggle of the working class in our day is connected with the appearance and development of transnational corporations. In this sphere, truly international amalgamated capital is opposing the working class of several countries at once--both developed and emerging states. This is naturally giving rise to international opposition by the workers. Moreover, what is important is that the opposition

is directed not against capital in general, as some sort of anonymous force, but in every individual case against a completely specific and definite international monopolistic octopus. The united actions of laborers in different countries in this context become concrete and definite and acquire real substance, promoting the cohesion of proletarians, regardless of the countries in which they work and the conditions in which they live.

The actual--now subjective as well as objective--internationalization of the basic social contradiction of capitalism naturally strengthens the basis of international relationships between various detachments of the laboring public. At the same time, this certainly does not mean the disappearance of specific problems interfering with the regulation of these relationships. First of all, there are the specifically national interests of each detachment, which certainly do not always coincide in all cases. There are also the specific regional interests of various detachments of the working class. Finally, there are also certain specific interests of the working class in socialist countries, developed capitalist countries and developing countries. Nevertheless, the existence of all these interests, which are understandably dissimilar in many respects, in no way modifies the decisive circumstance of the indisputable common interest of all detachments of the working class in the basic and main sphere--the struggle for the liberation of labor, for the elimination of exploitative relationships and for their replacement with the collectivist relationships of socialism.

Consequently, it is particularly important today to thoroughly consider all of the national interests and features of various detachments of the working class and to organize their cooperation in such a way as to avoid violating these interests and to respect these features. The diversity of the forms of existence and struggle and the interests and features of various detachments of the working class is not a disuniting factor (although at times it is used by the opponents of socialism precisely with this in mind), but a factor ensuring the greater effectiveness of collective efforts.

"A NEW, COMPLEX AND VARIABLE GROUP OF CONTRADICTIONS HAS TAKEN SHAPE BETWEEN IMPERIALISM AND THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES," THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE POLITICAL REPORT TO THE 27TH PARTY CONGRESS NOTES.

Most of the former colonial countries have now won their independence, and the colonial system has ceased to exist in its classic form. The essence of the matter, however, has not changed much. Imperialism is still exploiting the former colonies, now independent countries, employing various methods for this purpose. The economic dependence of former colonies has been largely maintained. Therefore, even today there is an acute contradiction between, on the one hand, imperialism and its policy of oppressing the people of liberated countries and exploiting their natural resources and, on the other, the liberated states and their people, who are seeking total emancipation, including economic independence, and are trying to overcome the economic backwardness resulting from colonial domination. This contradiction takes different forms. One of the most noticeable is the developing countries' demand for a new world economic order--that is, essentially a demand for the democratization of international economic relations.

The contradiction between the developing countries and imperialism is undergoing--and this is very important--some differentiation. On the one hand, as some liberated countries shift to the socialist orientation, prerequisites are established for the transformation of this contradiction into a different one--the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. In other words, the contradiction between some liberated countries and imperialism and the contradiction between socialism and capitalism are merging. This process is ensuring the progressive convergence of the socialist-oriented developing countries and the socialist countries, especially the countries of the socialist community. It is probable that the trend toward socialist patterns of development in the former colonial world will grow stronger in the foreseeable future. This is attested to by the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, which proved that success in the resolution of national problems and the problem of surmounting underdevelopment can be achieved only by means of profound and fundamental social changes.

But this is only one part of the processes occurring in the former colonial world. The other side of the matter is the progression of some former colonial countries along the capitalist path and the establishment of a capitalist order in them. Furthermore, it is sometimes established in its present form--the form of monopolist capital. There is no question that the contradictions between these liberated countries and imperialism still exist, but they have acquired a different nature. In essence, they already include elements of capitalist competition, although the anti-imperialist aims of the foreign policy of these states are certainly still unquestionable.

The complexity of contradictions in the former colonial world certainly calls for thorough study. There is no question, however, that processes of social development are undergoing intensification and acceleration in these countries.

Special attention should be paid to the group of contradictions of world development which were discussed in general terms by K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin but which have taken concrete form only in our day. This is a group of contradictions common to all mankind, a group which could be defined as the contradictions between imperialism and all mankind. In this connection, researchers are showing a greater interest in what are customarily called the global problems of the present day. Above all, there is the threat of war, a nuclear war which would put the existence of all civilization in doubt. Furthermore, there are such problems as the need to surmount economic underdevelopment and to eradicate hunger and poverty, especially in the emerging countries. Finally, there is the group of problems in man's relationship with nature.

Many of the problems now called global resulted from man's mastery of the laws of nature without taking any measures to compensate for the injuries nature suffered as a result of anthropogenic changes. On the other hand, the social development of mankind, which certainly signified tremendous progress, gave rise to antagonistic social relations, accompanied not only by class conflicts, but also by ethnic oppression, the partition and repartition of the world, and wars--including world wars, capable of "undermining the very conditions of the existence of human society."¹¹ The genesis of global problems is

a special subject of scientific research. The political and topical aspect of the matter, an aspect which should be singled out, is the fact that the further existence of mankind, and not only its further progress, will be impossible without the resolution of the problems now called global.

And now, a few words about the fourth and last group of contradictions of contemporary world development--inter-imperialist contradictions. As speakers stressed at the 27th CPSU Congress, this group of contradictions has not been eliminated by class proximity, the incentive to join forces, military, political or economic integration, or the technological revolution. It stands to reason that these contradictions have also undergone certain changes in connection with the changes in the alignment and balance of power between individual groups of imperialist states. For example, whereas the United States actually dominated the capitalist world in the early postwar years, later new centers of power, Western Europe and Japan, arose as a result of the uneven development of capitalism and began competing successfully with America. Now, as the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress note, new economic and political centers of rivalry are taking shape in the capitalist world, primarily in the Pacific and in Latin America. The development of transnational monopolist capital is also adding new features to the general situation. A new knot of contradictions has arisen and is rapidly growing tighter--contradictions between transnational corporations and the national-state form of the political organization of society.

This discussion of the latest changes in the system of contradictions of world development seems to suggest that these changes embody the current stage in the historical evolution of human society. Above all, they reflect the nature of the present age as a TRANSITIONAL one. And this kind of age--an age of social revolutions--is always complicated, complex and, so to speak, multileveled.

Furthermore, it is completely obvious that the present system of contradictions of world development also fully reflects the content of our age as the AGE OF TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM: The main contradiction now is the one between the two opposite social systems; moreover, the resolution of contradictions of the general democratic and general human type is also more closely related to the resolution of the main contradiction of the present age because it objectively presupposes a struggle against imperialism, or even against the very bases of the exploitative order.

Finally, the present system of contradictions of world development reflects and determines the nature of this development, which is complex, multifaceted and differentiated. "A social revolution," V. I. Lenin wrote, "cannot occur other than in the form of an age combining the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in advanced countries with the ENTIRE RANGE of democratic and revolutionary movements, including national liberation movements."¹² Elsewhere Lenin stressed that the age of transition from capitalism to socialism will be "an age of an entire series of battles on ALL fronts--that is, battles over ALL economic and political issues."¹³ All of this is reflected externally in the constant increase in the number of participants in the social battles of our time.

In general, it is significant that each new stage in the evolution of the system of contradictions of world development was accompanied by the expansion of the group of active (deliberately or instinctively) forces of world history. This is not surprising. After all, the appearance and development of each contradiction inevitably give rise to new class (or group, national or international) interests and, consequently, new social movements of various types. Today the world is an arena of activity by antagonistic classes and by mass democratic movements of the most diverse composition. They have become active subjects in the struggle for social progress, regardless of whether or not their members are aware of this.

It was already noted above that all of the contradictions of contemporary world development are interrelated and influence one another. How is this actually reflected?

Above all, it is reflected in the fact that the general democratic contradiction between imperialism and the people of emerging countries is more frequently and more definitely engendering, as mentioned above, the desire to seek solutions to problems by choosing the socialist path of development. This is a great achievement of contemporary social progress and a new channel for its development.

It is further reflected in the fact that the labor movement in the capitalist countries is increasingly likely to demand socialist reforms as a vital necessity. The documents of fraternal parties in the capitalist countries indicate that they regard the struggle for socialism not as a distant prospect, but as the purpose of many aspects of their current activity. The convergence of the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism is an important sign of the times.

It is also reflected in the fact that the struggle to solve problems common to all mankind, global problems, is also gradually leading to an awareness of the need for serious social changes. It stands to reason that only a small percentage of the members of these movements are consciously working toward socialism. More and more people are acknowledging, however, the need for changes, and for truly profound changes. Even some prominent members of the bourgeois scientific community are gradually beginning to agree that the difficult problems posing a potential threat to the future of mankind simply cannot be solved without serious changes in the very nature of social development.

Finally, it is also reflected in the fact that the struggle between imperialist countries and monopolist groups is being influenced more and more clearly by world socialism and various currents of the struggle for social progress. The imperialist powers and monopolist groups waging a merciless struggle against one another are also striving, more now than in the pre-war years, to unite their efforts in the struggle against socialism and against the popular struggle for social reforms. The existing Western military-political blocs, especially NATO, have definite social aims. Their purpose is not the deflection of the military threat supposedly emanating from socialism--this threat never existed in the past and does not exist now--but struggle against socialism and all forces for social progress.

Here we have discussed primarily the influence of the main contradiction of the present age on other contradictions of world development. It stands to reason that these other contradictions also influence one another and the main contradiction of the present day. This matter calls for special investigation, but some general conclusions can already be drawn.

The contradictions of contemporary world development can be resolved only as a result of struggle--struggle between the two systems, class struggle in the capitalist and emerging countries and the struggle of people to solve general democratic and general human problems. It is just as obvious, however, that the course and forms of this struggle will depend on the current state of world development in general and on its distinctive features, stemming from the combination of social and technological revolutions in our day.

"The highest goal of mankind," V. I. Lenin once wrote, "is to grasp...the objective logic of economic evolution (the evolution of social existence) in its general and fundamental aspects for the more distinct, precise and discerning adaptation of the social consciousness and the consciousness of advanced classes to it."¹⁴ Consideration for Lenin's statement today primarily presupposes the realization that the prevention of world war and the accomplishment of peaceful coexistence by states with different social systems still constitute the most acute problem of mankind today--the most vital issue of the day and a prerequisite for progress in all spheres of human activity and, what is more, for the very existence of mankind. This must be taken into account in any consideration or investigation of ways of resolving all other contradictions of contemporary world development.

In other words, the objective logic of the historical process has now assigned priority to the GENERAL HUMAN contradiction. This possibility was foreseen by V. I. Lenin, who once noted that "from the standpoint of the basic Marxist ideals, the interests of social development are superior to the interests of the proletariat."¹⁵ Lenin's statement and the entire current situation are sometimes misinterpreted by people who allege that the problems of the class and social struggle are now of secondary importance, that in our time, for instance, the interests of class interaction by the proletariat and of proletarian internationalism should give way completely to some kind of interests and alliances unrelated to classes, and so forth. In our opinion, however, this approach attests to an inadequate understanding of the truly complex dialectics of our age, the dialectics of the interaction of its inherent contradictions.

Yes, the issue of war and peace, just as other global problems, is a problem common to all mankind. But how can genuine solutions be found? This presupposes not only new efforts in the sphere of scientific and technical development, but also the development and use of new criteria for the use of scientific and technical achievements. In other words, this is not simply a matter of the technological revolution and its further development, but of social revolution, the social liberation of man. "The question of the ends to which the fruits of the technological revolution will be used has become pivotal in the present-day sociopolitical struggle," the new edition of the CPSU Program states. "Science and technology have now made it possible to

secure abundance on earth and to create the material conditions for the flourishing of society and the development of the individual. These creations of the human mind and hands, however, are being turned against humanity itself by the force of class egotism and for the sake of the enrichment of the ruling elite of the capitalist world. This is the glaring contradiction accompanying man into the 21st century.

"It is not science and technology in themselves that pose a threat to peace. It is posed by imperialism and its policy--the policy of the most reactionary militarist and aggressive forces of our time. The threat can be eliminated only by curbing these forces."¹⁶

The absolute and overwhelming majority of mankind is interested in solving the problems defined as global. Only imperialism, representing an insignificant minority of the planet's population, is not interested in this. Imperialism is not only intensifying earlier global problems; it is also consolidating them and giving them catastrophic dimensions. It is precisely the development of imperialism that poses a threat to mankind's existence today, a threat to its future.

The present evolution of imperialism, especially its escalation of global problems to catastrophic dimensions, provides irrefutable proof of the accuracy of the Marxist analysis revealing the doomed nature of the capitalist system and the need to replace it with socialism. Now the process of world development as a whole, and not just internal processes of development in each individual capitalist country, attests to the vital need for profound social changes, the need for the revolutionary resolution of the contradictions engendered by the capitalist stage of mankind's development. Only this kind of revolutionary solution will give mankind, in K. Marx' words, the ability to live at peace with itself and with nature.

It is clear that forms of social change have always been and will always be infinitely varied. No single form should be canonized or turned into some kind of fetish. In essence, however, the present situation requires the most profound social changes on the global scale, changes attainable as a result of the simultaneous development of the class, democratic and anti-imperialist struggles.

It is quite obvious that mankind's further advance along the road of social progress will be accompanied by particularly strong and subtle resistance from its enemies. With this in mind, it is necessary to be particularly careful in selecting ways and forms of struggle for the social and national liberation of mankind. The main thing is that these ways and forms should be purposeful, and should take into account the implications of the use of modern weapons, the global balance of power and the actual potential and capabilities of the liberation struggle.

Taking all of these circumstances into account, our party clearly stresses in all of its documents that the main contradiction of our age should be resolved by peaceful means--that is, by competition between the two systems, during the course of which each will demonstrate which is more capable of securing the

conditions for the continuation of human existence and the comprehensive development of the individual. "We believe," M. S. Gorbachev said, "that each nation should prove the accuracy of its ideology and the advantages of its chosen order, not by force of arms, but solely and exclusively by force of example. This is our unshakeable conviction."¹⁷ Ideological differences of opinion must not extend to the sphere of intergovernmental relations. Attempts to do this could lead only to worldwide catastrophe.

The CPSU believes that in a world filled with acute contradictions, faced by the threat of catastrophe, there is only one reasonable, one acceptable way out--the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. This is not merely the absence of wars. This is the kind of international order in which good-neighbor relations and cooperation prevail instead of military strength, and in which there is the broad exchange of scientific and technical achievements and of cultural values for the benefit of all nations. The elimination of the need to spend colossal amounts on military needs would channel the fruits of labor exclusively toward constructive goals. The states choosing the path of independent development would be guarded against encroachment from outside, and this would facilitate their advancement toward national growth. Favorable opportunities would also be created for the resolution of mankind's global problems through the collective efforts of all states. Peaceful coexistence is in the interest of all countries and all people.

The potential to secure this new international order exists. It is the historic mission of socialism and all progressive and peaceful forces on the planet to achieve this and to save mankind from catastrophe. The peaceful resolution of contradictions of a general democratic nature, such as the contradictions between imperialism and the emerging countries, is the goal of the people of these countries. They now see the main solution in struggle for the democratization of international relations and against imperialism's attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations, including struggle for a new world economic order and for the economic security of all countries. Obviously, when imperialism tries to solve some international problem by force, people respond with resolute resistance, including armed opposition. In these cases, the socialist countries also oppose such attempts actively, in complete accordance with the standards of international law laid down in the UN Charter, and support the victims of aggression in the belief that the support of people repulsing imperialist aggression is part of the struggle to defend world peace.

Finally, as far as the general human problems of world development are concerned, it is clear that the radical social transformation of human society is an essential condition for their fundamental resolution. This kind of transformation, however, cannot be accomplished in response to someone's orders. It will be accomplished gradually, as socioeconomic contradictions develop, prerequisites for social change mature, and people realize the need for it. This means that although only socialism can provide the radical solution, it would be impossible to wait for it to triumph everywhere. Some kind of intermediate solution, based on today's social conditions, must be found. This kind of intermediate solution has been proposed by socialism, all forces for peace and democracy and the emerging countries. Now that the world is

divided into two social systems, the optimal solution to general human problems (if not the final one, then at least one preventing their catastrophic exacerbation) is cooperation by states with different social systems and by all of the different social and political forces interested in securing a peaceful and happy future for mankind.

"We are realists," M. S. Gorbachev said at the 27th CPSU Congress, "and we are fully aware that the two worlds are divided, and deeply divided, by many things. But we are also fully aware of something else: The need to solve urgent problems common to all mankind should motivate them to act together and should arouse a human instinct for self-preservation of unprecedented strength. This is the stimulus for solutions corresponding to the realities of our day.... The actual dialectics of contemporary development consist in competition and confrontation between the two systems combined with an increasing tendency toward the interdependence of the states of the world community. It is precisely in this way, through the struggle of opposites, with difficulty and almost by touch, that a contradictory but INTERDEPENDENT AND LARGELY INTEGRATED WORLD is taking shape."

"The world today," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress says, "is complex, diverse, dynamic and filled with conflicting tendencies and contradictions. This is a world of the most complex alternatives and hopes. Never before has our earthly home been subjected to such excessive political and physical strain. Never before has man taken so much from nature and been so vulnerable to a power he himself has created."

In general, it could be said that the development of threats to the future of mankind has been an exponential process to date. What is needed now is concerted effort by states with a sincere desire to develop international interaction in favor of peace and progress, people and their mass organizations, to secure another exponent--the liberation struggle, the struggle to prevent war, to democratize international relations and to achieve the broad-scale peaceful cooperation of states, free from attempts to use it for interference in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples.

The extensive unification of all social forces in today's world could be secured realistically on this platform. After all, this is essentially a matter of struggle to save mankind. Today the goals of this struggle seem to be of a general human and general democratic nature. The essence of the problems that must be solved and their close relationship to social progress, however, are gradually giving global problems, the struggle to solve them and, consequently, the contradiction between imperialism and all mankind more profound social meaning.

In other words, the same thing is happening in the international arena as in the capitalist world: The struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism are gradually converging. This process of convergence is exceptionally productive and promising. There is no doubt, however, that its largely spontaneous development requires the active influence of the subjective factor. And it is completely obvious that the most important factor from this standpoint is the activity of the world communist movement, which has been

operating, ever since the days of the Communist Manifesto, as a force fighting for socialism and as a force consistently defending the cause of peace for this very reason.

In the time since K. Marx and V. I. Lenin lived and worked, the system of international contradictions has undergone significant changes. These changes have sometimes led to the conclusion that Marxism has not been confirmed and has not proved to be effective. In fact, the entire discussion above confirms the accuracy of the basic trends discovered by Marxism-Leninism. Experience also confirms that the Marxist-Leninist methodology is the only methodology securing the correct understanding and correct analysis of contemporary events.

The weapons with which Marx and Engels, and later Lenin, armed revolutionaries are a powerful force. It is the paramount duty of their disciples and successors to preserve, augment and utilize this force in the interest of mankind.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 46, pt 1, p 47.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 318.
3. Ibid., vol 25, p 264.
4. Ibid., vol 42, p 75.
5. "CPSU Program. New Edition," PRAVDA, 7 March 1986, p 3.
6. V. I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 35, p 278.
7. Ibid., vol 44, p 149.
8. K. Marx and F. Engels, Op. cit., vol 9, p 230.
9. "CPSU Program. New Edition," PRAVDA, 7 March 1986, p 4.
10. Ibid.
11. V. I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 36, p 396.
12. Ibid., vol 30, p 112.
13. Ibid., vol 54, p 464.
14. Ibid., vol 18, p 345.
15. Ibid., vol 4, p 220.
16. PRAVDA, 7 March 1986, p 4.
17. M. S. Gorbachev, "Izbrannyye rechi i statii" [Selected Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1985, p 323.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

JOURNAL CITES NEW CPSU PROGRAM, ANALYZES WORKING CLASS ROLE

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 17-33

[Article by T. T. Timofeyev: "The Leading Force for Social Progress"; passages rendered in all capital letters printed in boldface in source]

[Excerpts] "The main revolutionary class of the present era was and is the working class" ("CPSU Program. New Edition").

The 27th CPSU Congress is the major milestone in the Leninist party's activities during this new historical period. All of its work was permeated with the spirit of creativity, adherence to Bolshevik principles and intolerance for shortcomings and errors. The congress confirmed the general line of party domestic and foreign policy. It revealed all of the details of tendencies in the development of the international class struggle and the distinctive features of contemporary international relations of the mid-1980's and presented a scientific forecast of their possible progress in the near future.

The congress defined basic guidelines and the most effective ways of accomplishing the multifaceted tasks now facing Soviet communists. The decisions of the party congress directed attention to new approaches to many important economic and sociopolitical problems of the 12th Five-Year Plan and the period up to 2000. The current five-year plan should be a turning point, particularly in securing a definite shift toward economic intensification, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the continued augmentation of mass initiative and activity, the growth of labor productivity and the enhancement of the operational efficiency of all laborers. The congress adopted a program for the planned and comprehensive improvement of socialism and the further advancement of the Soviet society by means of accelerated socioeconomic development. The new edition of the CPSU Program is justifiably viewed by the general world public as a program of active struggle for peace and social progress.

The 27th party congress and its results are of colossal international significance. There are several reasons for this. Soviet communists regard their efforts to improve the socialist society and to advance toward communism as their "most important international duty, meeting the interests of the world

socialist system, the international working class and all mankind."¹ This was clearly and cogently stated from the congress rostrum by representatives of fraternal communist and workers parties, various revolutionary movements and mass labor organizations. The same idea is present in the numerous reports in the progressive press on the decisions of the 27th congress. As these articles and reports ascertain, the congress represents an important frontier in the world communist, workers and revolutionary liberation movement. It has armed the laboring public with a clear and concise program for the further intensification of the struggle against the danger of war and the struggle to strengthen forces for peace. The CPSU, as the congress documents reaffirm, believes that the fatal inevitability of world war does not exist. It is the historic mission of socialism and of all progressive and peaceful forces on our planet to save mankind from thermonuclear catastrophe.

The conclusions of the 27th CPSU Congress are based on thoroughly scientific Marxist-Leninist principles of social analysis, on the reliable foundation of revolutionary theory and its dialectical connection with practice. Defining the objective conditions and basic laws of the struggle of forces for progress against reactionary forces in the international arena, the CPSU stresses that the entire course of world development "corroborates the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the nature and basic content of the present era. THIS IS AN ERA OF TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM, OF HISTORICAL CONFRONTATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO WORLDWIDE SOCIOPOLITICAL SYSTEMS, AN ERA OF SOCIALIST AND NATIONAL LIBERATION REVOLUTIONS AND THE COLLAPSE OF COLONIALISM, AN ERA OF STRUGGLE BY THE MAIN GENERATORS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT--WORLD SOCIALISM, THE WORKERS AND COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, THE PEOPLE OF EMERGING STATES AND MASS DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS--AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND ITS POLICY OF AGGRESSION AND OPPRESSION AND FOR PEACE, DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL PROGRESS."²

Assessing the changes in international affairs from a scientifically valid position, the Leninist party believes that the most important trends in world development are determined, on the one hand, by the continued reinforcement of real socialism's positions, the growth of its prestige and influence and the augmentation of the role of the popular masses, wanting a new life based on the principles of justice, and, on the other, by imperialism's resistance of positive progressive changes in the world. The aggressive intrigues of reactionary, militarist groups are being opposed by peaceful forces: the socialist countries, the international workers and communist movement, dozens of young independent states and broad antiwar democratic movements.

The profound content of our era, which has been completely taken into account in 27th CPSU Congress documents, provides the key to the correct understanding of many current developments, including the problems which are objectively facing the working class and the problems whose resolution constitutes its worldwide historic mission. Obviously, the essence of these problems varies for different segments of the world working class: the working class of the socialist world, the proletariat of the industrially developed capitalist states and the workers of developing countries. By the same token, the scientific analysis of natural trends and tendencies in the development of the working class should be conducted consistently, with a view to the differing socioeconomic and sociopolitical conditions in socialist and capitalist societies.

The documents of the 27th CPSU Congress are of tremendous value in the comprehension of the developmental trends and prospects of the Soviet working class. "The CPSU," the new edition of the party program adopted by the congress notes, "believes that the comprehensive progress of Soviet society and its consistent advancement toward communism under the present internal and international conditions can and must be secured through the ACCELERATION OF THE SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRY. This is the party's strategy for the qualitative transformation of all facets of life in the Soviet society."³

In the case of the USSR working class, some particularly significant aspects of what M. S. Gorbachev called the "revolutionary objective" are connected with the fundamental renewal of the material and technical base through a new process of national economic reconstruction. It is now being accomplished at a time of intense technological revolution, which is having a tremendous effect on various aspects of modern production, on man himself and on his environment. The content and nature of labor are changing along with the worker's place in the technological system. This is the basis for the current improvement of socialist production relations and the augmentation of the importance and role of the human factor. "The vanguard in Soviet society is reserved for the working class," the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress stresses. "By virtue of its position in the system of socialist production, its political experience, its high level of awareness and organization and its labor and political activity, the working class unites our society and plays the leading role in the improvement of socialism and the construction of communism."⁴ It is now distinguished by the continued rise of its level of social activity. This is being promoted by its continuous growth--both quantitative and qualitative. Whereas there were 46.3 million workers employed in the USSR national economy in 1960 and 64.8 million in 1970, the figure exceeded 81 million by the middle of the 1980's. Acting as the main productive force in society, the working class is also the builder of collectivist social relations and new and advanced forms of public life. Furthermore, the working class is active in all spheres and on all levels of the functioning of the social organism--from the government and the national economic complex to the primary production collective and the family as the social nucleus. The CPSU now believes that its main objectives include the guarantee of broader scope for the social creativity of laborers and the fullest possible use of the human factor in the interests of social progress.

The acceleration of the socioeconomic development of the USSR, as the 27th CPSU Congress stressed, will primarily require profound changes in the decisive sphere of human activity--the economy. This is why the problem of enhancing the effectiveness of the labor and all of the productive activity of the working class, the improvement of the operations of all labor collectives and each worker, is of such colossal importance now.

Besides this, the continued qualitative improvement of the human element of society's productive forces is particularly important. The growing socioeconomic potential of the working class is largely a result of the rising general and professional standards of workers in all spheres of the national economy and the widespread development of skills, awareness, a sense of

national proprietorship and the psychological personality features corresponding to the requirements of the technological revolution.

It is noteworthy that the indicators of the cultural and technical standards of the Soviet working class are rising quite quickly. Skilled workers now constitute the overwhelming majority of the working class: In industry alone, for example, they account for around 75 percent of all workers. Their general educational level has also risen. People with a secondary (complete or partial) and higher education already represent more than 80 percent of them. The cultural and technical growth of the working class is accelerating the development of large groups of skilled workers whose general and professional standards are gradually approaching the level of certain strata of the intelligentsia and employees. In the late 1970's and early 1980's, around 25 percent of all workers achieved high skill indicators in their occupations, 33 percent acquired a complete secondary education and another 9 percent graduated from specialized academic institutions (providing them with a higher education than a complete secondary school).

The accurate conclusions drawn from the acknowledgement of the leading role of the human factor's qualitative features in the contemporary development of the working class are of great fundamental significance. After all, the technological revolution demands not only a slight rise in the cultural and technical standards of workers, but sometimes also requires a change in their skills. According to some surveys, in production units where the latest scientific and technical achievements have had the most perceptible effect and where the equipment and technology are of a scientific-industrial nature, 80-90 percent of the jobs must be filled by workers with sound vocational training (including a specialized secondary education for 50-55 percent). At present, considerably fewer workers have this kind of education. This means that the educational reform in our country, especially the transfer to universal vocational training, is an important prerequisite for the continued qualitative growth of the working class.

But the problem of securing higher cultural and technical standards meeting the requirements of the technological revolution is not confined to the introduction of universal elementary vocational training. The acceleration of scientific and technical progress and of general social progress causes such quick changes in the nature of production that large categories of workers already have to change their professions or at least radically change their skills more than once in their lifetime. "The continued transformation of labor under the conditions of technological revolution," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress says, "is making higher demands on the educational background and vocational training of people. In essence, what is needed today is A UNIFIED SYSTEM OF CONTINUOUS EDUCATION."⁵

The development of the technological revolution and the need for tens of millions of people to change occupations require--particularly in a consciously managed socialist society--a planned and systemic approach. In this connection, it is significant that the conclusion regarding the acceleration of changes in labor under the influence of the technological revolution reinforces the objective social need for a system of continuous education. At the

Volga Motor Vehicle Plant, for example, new workers have immediately been informed of their future possible changes of occupation for several years now.

This will necessitate the investigation and resolution of many problems. Since occupations of different types and of varying appeal are distributed unevenly in different areas of production, this practice cannot always be carried out consistently within a single enterprise. In the future it could acquire a territorial and sectorial structure, but the creation of this kind of system will require the careful consideration of possible methods of accomplishing this task and an investigation of its probable socioeconomic and cultural consequences.

The results of the comprehension and prediction of social processes thereby become the basis or foundation of a new social law, on which the further course of scientific development will largely depend.

Obviously, in the socialist society the nature of problems engendered by scientific and technical progress is profoundly different from the nature of the conflicting effects of the technological revolution in the exploitative society and is essentially its opposite. After all, in the socialist society the contradictions of the technological revolution are not antagonistic; they can be consciously and purposefully resolved. Consequently, the technological revolution can work in the interests of the entire society and all of its members. In this sense, it is precisely in the socialist society that scientific and technical progress and its consequences are filled with even more genuine humanistic meaning. This is precisely the aim of the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the documents it ratified.

A correct assessment of the social forces opposing imperialism in the capitalist world is one of the important and crucial goals of communist activity. It is no coincidence that this subject matter is discussed at length in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress. Marxist-Leninists respond with principled and logical arguments to all attempts to underestimate the worldwide historic mission of the working class, to misinterpret the objective conditions and factors determining its development and to deny its ability to rally and unite the broad popular masses in a struggle against reactionary forces.

Communists justifiably believe, as the proceedings of the 27th CPSU Congress conclusively reaffirmed, that the main revolutionary class of the present era was and is the working class. Over and over again, life has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist statement about the rising role of the working class in society. The use of science in production is augmenting its ranks with more highly skilled workers. Class battles are giving the working class even stronger unity. The fundamental interests of the proletariat are making the need for the unity of the workers movement and the solidarity of all its members increasingly urgent.

During the current phase of the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism and of the attacks on laborers and their organizations by

monopolistic groups, the theories of trade-unionist "economism" and all types of anarchistic ideas, the supporters of which are groundlessly contrasting the fundamental interests of hired workers engaged in physical and mental labor, are being advertised more loudly and on a broader scale. Falsely defining the composition and boundaries of the proletariat, they repeat bourgeois propaganda's lies about the "decline" of the revolutionary workers movement, the imminent "bankruptcy" of scientific socialism, etc.

Bourgeois and reformist authors and various types of "leftist"-opportunist ideologists who attack Marxist-Leninist precepts regarding the leading socio-historical role of the working class resort to the most diverse methods.

Above all, there is the groundless allegation that Marxists misinterpret the processes of social differentiation, and the false propaganda about "deproletarianization" and the mythical "disappearance" of the working class in the second half of the 20th century.

Both rightist and "leftist" revisionists often follow the example of anti-Marxists in arbitrarily including certain categories of exploited hired labor in the "new middle class," the "new petty bourgeoisie" and so forth, or take the opposite tack and falsely include a large part of the peasantry or lumpen-proletarian and other declassé elements in the working class.

Whereas some bourgeois-reformist authors (from, for example, J. Hobson, G. Kunov, E. Lederer and other propagandists of the "new middle class" theory at the beginning of the 20th century to the "neo-revisionists," such as A. Gorz, N. Poulantzas, D. Hill and others) want to artificially "contract" the boundaries of the working class (confining it only to workers engaged in physical labor or only to its factory and plant nucleus), other Western sociologists and economists are inclined to engage in the equally incorrect "expansion" of the composition of the proletariat by including semiproletarian and lumpenproletarian elements and all "marginal" strata in its ranks or by engineering various types of mechanical theories about the fundamentally "new" class structure, the "new separate" social strata and so forth. These views are characteristic of bourgeois ideologists and of several representatives of the pseudoradical "neo-Marxism" (A. G. Frank, S. Amin, C. Cardozo, C. Furtado and others). The views are also shared by some authors in the United States and Western Europe (including S. Aronowitz and others).

The ideologists of reformism and contemporary opportunism--rightist and "leftist"--misinterpret the major processes distinguishing the development of the international army of labor and its main detachments. They often make groundless attempts to separate or "divide" the working class, particularly with the aid of artificial criteria, and strive to define membership in the proletariat not according to the social class, but according to some other features. In this process, they assign priority either to differences in occupational skills or differences in the status of various categories of workers in the labor market.

One important objective prerequisite for the successful performance of the sociohistorical mission of the international working class is the intensification of the deep-seated processes leading to the reinforcement of the worldwide

labor army and the growth of its ranks. Whereas the proletariat in the capitalist countries numbered around 10 million people in the middle of the 19th century, the figure exceeded 30 million at the beginning of the 20th. The total number of hired workers in these countries at the beginning of this century was close to 80-85 million.

In the middle of our century the total number of hired workers throughout the capitalist world approached 300 million; by the beginning of the 1980's the figure exceeded 560 million. The continuous growth and consolidation of the working class were among the objective factors of social progress in the 20th century.

Changes as noticeable as these are having a serious effect on social life in many Afro-Asian and Latin American states and on the prospect of new social battles and the development of revolutionary processes here. Life, as the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress correctly point out, has set difficult tasks "for the young and rapidly growing working class in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is being opposed by foreign capital and by local exploiters, and struggle is enhancing its political maturity and organization."⁶

The attempts to portray the working class and the workers movement as a social force without a future, a force which will inevitably give up its leading sociohistorical role to other classes or to some indistinct social strata, are completely groundless and invalid. Marxism-Leninism has scientifically substantiated the leading role of the contemporary working class. As the most progressive and revolutionary class of our era, the working class was and is the main productive force in society. This is precisely why it is capable of leading and winning the struggle of the broad popular masses against monopolist capital, the struggle for the transition from capitalism to socialism, the struggle to build a socialist and communist society.

In today's capitalist society, the hired labor sphere is extending beyond the bounds of physical production. The increased significance of distribution and services and their more pronounced subordination to capital are expanding the boundaries of the working class, particularly through the inclusion of workers hired in these sectors. Whereas workers engaged in physical labor were predominant in the proletariat during previous stages of the development of mechanized production, now scientific and technical progress and the automation of production are augmenting the role of workers engaged in skilled mental labor, including engineering and technical specialists engaged in the maintenance of modern machinery. In other words, the technological revolution is not "eroding" the working class, but is diversifying its productive functions and making its occupational and social appearance more complex. Some of the important tendencies in the development of the working class during the present phase of the technological revolution are the rising general and occupational standards and the intellectual growth of broad strata of the working class, although this tendency is being opposed by monopolies in various ways in the capitalist society.

The working class in the developed capitalist world is definitely undergoing important changes. They are connected largely with the effects of scientific

and technical progress under the conditions of state-monopolist capitalism. None of this, however, provides any grounds for the propaganda theories about the "erosion" of the proletariat or its "dilution" in other strata and in new social movements, the "waning" of class struggle and so forth. The working class, communists have repeatedly stressed, was and is the leader of world development and its main "revolutionary subject."

The repulsion of bourgeois and opportunist attempts to belittle the socio-historical role of the proletariat by the conscious vanguard of the workers movement is particularly important in the present phase of ideological confrontation. This is conclusively attested to by the arguments between Marxists and their opponents at the second international forum on the working class and the labor movement in Paris (in 1985). The central theme of the debates was the assessment of the technological revolution's effects on the working class. Some speakers from Western countries adhered to the false, "narrow" interpretation of the boundaries of the working class, thereby underestimating the dynamism and potential of its development under the conditions of technological revolution. In addition, they deliberately understated the influence of the nature of social relations on the social consequences of the technological revolution and distorted the entire issue of the completely different developmental conditions and status of the working class in the socialist and capitalist societies.

The Marxists responded by pointing to the fundamentally different effects of technological advances on the status of the working class in the different social systems. They demonstrated how the working class, as an active subject of technical progress, influences the forms, directions and final results of this progress with its production and public activity. Marxists from several capitalist countries examined the social consequences of contemporary technical changes in connection with the struggle of the workers movement against unemployment, the instability of the status of labor in production and the threat of disqualification.

The many facts and events testifying to the intensification of social antagonisms in the countries of the world capitalist system are the best rejoinder to the unscientific myths of "deproletarianization" and the "waning" of the class struggle under the conditions of contemporary state-monopolist capitalism. The social tension in many links of this system is naturally intensified as the technological revolution progresses, in connection with the increased economic instability of bourgeois society. Under these conditions, the strategy of "social revenge," to which reactionary groups of state-monopolist capitalism decided to resort, is escalating class conflicts and heightening socioeconomic and political instability in several capitalist countries.

It is indicative that the number of participants in social conflicts in the capitalist countries continued to rise in recent decades. For example, whereas around 282 million people took part in these conflicts in just the zone of developed capitalism during a 5-year period (from 1975 through 1979), the figure was 335 million in the next 5 years (1980-1984). Furthermore, there was a considerable increase in the number of participants in political demonstrations (see Table 2 [table not reproduced]).

The uneven development of the strike struggle is the result of several factors. Some of the main ones are the consequences of crisis-related processes. The economic crisis of the mid-1970's, the most severe in half a century, was followed by a new crisis at the beginning of the 1980's. In addition, it is significant that the incorporation of the latest automation equipment by monopolies in the capitalist countries, including robots and flexible production systems, and the structural reorganization of the economy exacerbated the employment problem. The threat of layoffs and the more intense competition for jobs diminished the activity of some segments of the working class.

Furthermore, it is no secret that the number of various types of short-term strikes is rising in many capitalist countries. These, however, are not recorded in official statistics. The degree to which this distorts the actual picture of the strike struggle can be judged from the example of the FRG: According to official data, 40,000 people in the FRG went on strike in 1982. Data for 1983 were not published, and no data are available for 1984. Calculations based on information from the West German communist and labor-union press indicate, however, that 3.3 million people participated in social-class conflicts in 1984, including 1.6 million in economic strikes and 1.7 million in political demonstrations. Since the number of long-term strikes recorded in FRG statistics was approximately the same in 1984 as in 1982, it is clear that only a fraction of the actual number of strikers is recorded in official statistics.

The correlation of different types of strike demands is changing in several capitalist countries. The demands of laborers for the cessation of layoffs and for a shorter work week are being assigned priority with increasing frequency.

The increased activity of union members and their heightened demands are reflected in strikes, in their participation in the struggle for cuts in military spending and in the noticeable convergence of the goals of union members and members of general democratic, including antinuclear, movements. For example, the struggle for peace and against the arms race is merging with the struggle for jobs. Millions of laborers take part in mass demonstrations under the slogans "Jobs and peace!" and "New jobs instead of new bombs and missiles!" In the United States, for example, national unions representing a substantial part of the labor federation--slightly over half of all AFL-CIO members in all--have taken part in nuclear freeze demonstrations. In Western Europe and other parts of the world, in New Zealand, Australia, Japan and the ASEAN countries, many laborers annually participate in mass protest demonstrations against the arms race and for the use of the funds earmarked for the production of lethal weapons in the expansion of social programs.

This intermingling of the important goals of the socioeconomic and political struggle of the laboring public and its mass organizations is a sign of the times. It also reflects the laboring public's increasing awareness of the pernicious effects of militarization, which is preventing the resolution of acute economic and social problems. In various parts of the capitalist world, there is a growing awareness of the indisputable fact that increased employment could contribute much to the development and reinforcement of normal

economic relations between countries with different social structures, the relaxation of international tension and the establishment of lasting peace between nations.

The decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress instruct social scientists to investigate the most important social processes regularly, including tendencies in the development of the working class in the present and the future. In this connection, the theoretical summarization of the rich collective experience accumulated by the international working class and its most progressive segments and the analysis of various aspects of this experience and the variety of changing conditions and forms of class struggle by the laboring public are of great importance. There is great methodological value in the statement, made in the documents of the 27th congress, that the communist and workers parties in the non-socialist world are operating under difficult and contradictory conditions. The conditions and forms of their struggle cover an extremely broad range. This does not reduce the movement's potential, however, but, on the contrary, augments it. The experience accumulated by communist parties is valuable international property.

Soviet researchers have contributed and are contributing to the stimulation of the thorough Marxist study and analysis of the valuable international fighting experience of the proletariat and its communist vanguard during various specific periods of history. On the threshold of the 27th CPSU Congress, during the preparations for it, the party central committee is known to have set the important objective of "thoroughly analyzing and realistically assessing all that has been accomplished since the 26th congress and determining the prospects for future development."⁹ This applied completely to the pre-congress tasks set for researchers of the labor and communist movements. What kind of results could Soviet researchers of the labor movement report to the 27th party congress?

As we know, the study of the history of the working class and of tendencies in its development in our country and on the international level is one of the fields of science where certain traditions already exist. The Soviet study of history, which is based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the worldwide historic mission of the proletariat, has always viewed the study of problems connected with the status of the working class, its struggle and the history of this struggle as the most important field of research in the social sciences. Furthermore, in recent decades Soviet researchers of the labor movement have concentrated on the investigation of such topics as the birth and establishment of the proletariat and the main tendencies in its development in the capitalist era; the struggle of the proletariat and its organizations in defense of the vital interests of laborers; the formation and activities of proletarian political parties; the role of the working class and its progressive organizations in modern and contemporary revolutions, especially the Great October Socialist Revolution and the revolutions of the 1940's in several European and Asian countries; the development of the international solidarity of labor. Considerable advances have been made in the systematic study of the development of socialist ideas and the establishment of Marxism as the scientific ideology of the revolutionary proletarian vanguard, which was enriched and raised to unprecedented heights in the 20th century by the genius of V. I. Lenin.

Marxist researchers in our country and abroad have prepared several valuable publications on these and other topics, including such important works as fundamental biographies of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin, works on the history of our party, monographs on the history of the three Internationals and the Paris Commune of 1871, histories of the three Russian revolutions and studies of various historical stages in the development of the socialist society. The CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and researchers from the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, higher academic institutions and other scientific establishments and organizations were instrumental in the preparation of these works.

The broader scales of the study of key aspects of the international workers movement necessitated the establishment of a new scientific center in the second half of the 1960's--the Institute of the International Workers Movement, which was made responsible for the comprehensive study of tendencies in the development of the working class and the activities of the laboring public in various parts of the world. Social scientists in the fraternal socialist countries began cooperating more closely in the study of this subject matter at that same time. At the beginning of the 1970's a commission for multi-lateral cooperation by the academies of sciences in the socialist countries in the study of "The Working Class in the World Revolutionary Process" was founded.¹⁰

At the beginning of the 1970's it became obvious that the Marxist-Leninist study of the workers movement had reached a point necessitating, first of all, the summarization of the findings of earlier research projects; secondly, the filling of gaps discovered during the course of these projects; thirdly, the collation and supplementation of the findings of earlier investigations of individual facets and aspects of the workers movement in the past and the present, the results of the compilation of "national biographies" of the working class in various areas, the results of studies of the history of its political parties and professional associations on the national, regional and international levels and the results of the study of the complex dialectics of the proletariat's ideological and theoretical growth. In short, the time had arrived for a global, multifaceted and comprehensive interpretation of the history of the working class--primarily to determine its principal, long-term, common tendencies.

This is precisely why the team of researchers at the Institute of the International Workers Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences, began working with other authors at the beginning of the 1970's on a general multi-volume work on the development of the world proletariat, the history and theory of its class struggle and the activities of its organizations. The results of this massive and complicated task were reflected in the eight volumes of the basic work, "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii" [The International Workers Movement. Questions of History and Theory], published by the Mysl Publishing House. The research covered a period of history of great significance, beginning with the birth of the proletariat and its establishment as a class and ending with the present day.

The fundamental importance of this collective work and its originality stem primarily from its thorough disclosure of the perceptible changes in

Marxist-Leninist studies of earlier periods of history and the current phase of the development of the working class. The very scales and boundaries of research have also changed: Now it extends to many spheres and levels of the workers movement which were previously mentioned only in passing or were bypassed altogether. Something else is also important: The multi-volume work is based on an organic synthesis of the results of the development of different fields of science and their greatest achievements in our country and abroad, where Marxist researchers and historians, sociologists and economists with similar views have acquired stronger influence in recent decades.

One of the characteristic features of the research conducted by the authors of the eight-volume work is the combination of an analytical approach to the extremely rich and voluminous empirical material with the necessary sound generalizations of specific historic developments, social and other processes, with constant concern about the correct methodology and historical analysis of the study of the working class. A chronologically consistent elucidation of a multitude of historical facts is closely coordinated with research on the analytical level.

Another fundamental and significant feature of the collective work also warrants consideration. An important step has been taken toward overcoming the situation in which the proletarian movement in pre-revolutionary Russia and the social history of the working class of the USSR were examined separately from the history of the workers movement in foreign countries: within the framework of our country's history in the first case, and within the framework of world (modern and contemporary) history in the second. It is true that some points of "intersection" or interaction were sometimes found between these movements, but only in studies of, for example, the bilateral contacts of Russian Social Democrats with the socialist party of some Western country or of the activities of international workers organizations with members of the Russian proletariat participating, and so forth. This multi-volume work, on the other hand, presents a complete picture of the workers movement and the development of the international solidarity of labor. The history of the working class in our country is presented in this general work as part of the development of the world army of labor and the international revolutionary workers movement.

General or common tendencies (although frequently occurring at different times and under different conditions) in the social, economic and political activities of the working class are revealed in all volumes of the publication. This applies to its early stages and to the present day. For example, the consequences of the technological revolution and changes in the composition and appearance of the proletariat in the capitalist countries are analyzed in several sections. Important processes and fundamental social changes in the working class of the socialist society during the course of the introduction of scientific and technical achievements and under the conditions of the growing constructive potential of the laboring masses, the heightened efficiency of their labor and so forth, are described in the eighth volume. It is precisely on this basis that it became possible to summarize the developmental experience of the working class and to establish the coordinates and vectors of this development, the clarification of which aids considerably in the

comprehension of general tendencies in its quantitative and qualitative growth and the fundamental differences between its roles in the capitalist and socialist societies.

The particular approach taken to the analysis of the proletarian struggle under capitalism and the subject matter of the labor movement also produces positive results. This approach represents a comprehensive study of processes reflected in individual events (including strikes, political demonstrations by the masses and others) and changes in the awareness of the working class, in its mass psychology and in its beliefs, which have always reflected the characteristic levels of perception of scientific ideology and degree of awareness of different laboring strata. In this multi-volume publication, this approach aids in the reproduction of the entire panorama of social and sociopolitical development, the "behavioral" and moral history of the working class and the workers movement over several centuries and up to the present day.

In general, the eight-volume collective work, "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii," is a major contribution to the scientific investigation of the world labor movement, an investigation which quite conclusively confirms the accuracy of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine regarding the role of the working class as the most advanced, revolutionary-transforming force and great builder of a new social order. This provides scientific evidence of the accuracy of the conclusions drawn in the new edition of the CPSU Program about the sociohistorical mission of the working class and its communist vanguard.

Several other scientific works developing and clarifying the same line of research were also compiled during the period between the 26th and 27th CPSU congresses and have made their contribution to the scientific study of the working class.¹¹

It is clear, therefore, that Soviet researchers studying tendencies in the development of the working class and the workers movement accomplished a great deal on the threshold of the 27th CPSU Congress. The decisions and documents of the congress, however, call for the mobilization and concentration of our scientific forces to the point at which the more thorough and more comprehensive analysis of several important new and urgent problems can be accomplished. The comprehensive elucidation of these and a timely scientific response to them will also be the responsibility of RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYY MIR.

A bold and innovative approach to the analysis and resolution of many important problems in social development, the approach which is so characteristic of the proceedings and documents of the 27th CPSU Congress, encourages Soviet scientists to heighten their creative activity, to strive for the further augmentation of the impact and productivity of their work and to strengthen the connection between basic theoretical research and the requirements of everyday life. Focusing attention on the importance of a broader response by the social sciences to the specific needs of practice, the congress assigned social scientists the responsibility of "staying on the alert for changes in everyday life, keeping an eye on new developments and drawing conclusions

capable of serving as a reliable guide in practice."¹² In this connection, it was correctly emphasized that "the atmosphere of creativity the party has established in all spheres of life is particularly productive in the social sciences."¹³

The present world situation resembles a turning point in many respects. As speakers quite justifiably said at the 27th CPSU Congress, the changes in world development "are so profound and significant that they demand the reassessment and comprehensive analysis of all factors."¹⁴ This applies above all to factors connected with the atmosphere of nuclear confrontation. It also applies to the consequences of the exacerbation of internal conflicts in the exploitative order, including the fundamental antagonism between labor and capital.

Cardinal changes are now taking place in the life of the working class and all mankind, changes connected with the technological revolution, with its after-effects, with the accelerated rates of socioeconomic development in the socialist society, with the intensification of the world revolutionary process and with the new phase of competition between the two systems, the global confrontation between scientific socialism and the reactionary bourgeois ideology. Soviet social scientists are paying closer attention to new developments in world events and in the workers movement, proceeding from the appraisals and statements made at the 27th party congress.

It is particularly important to secure the comprehensive and timely study of problems whose resolution would promote the heightened activity of the working class in the socialist society.

Marxist researchers have done much to reveal the dynamics of the proletariat's development in capitalist countries under the conditions of the intense conflicts of contemporary state-monopolist capitalism in connection with the effects of the technological revolution. Nevertheless, the new phase of this revolution and the stepped-up computerization and robotization of production demand the study and serious consideration of the changes caused by these processes in the living conditions, status and struggle of the working class as the main productive force and the leading sociopolitical force in society today. It is of great importance to reveal the new methods of exploiting highly skilled manpower, methods developed during the course of the technological revolution, and to investigate the glaring contradiction between the more important role of the working class in production and its status as an oppressed class in the socioeconomic and political structure of bourgeois society. More attention must be paid to subject matter connected with the clarification and examination of the progressive democratic alternative proposed by antimonopolist forces and their struggle against the arms race, the militarization of society and the mounting danger of the military-technical deformation of the technological revolution and its results by the monopolies.

Important tasks lie ahead for our researchers in the study of various areas and forms of class struggle by the laboring public and the interaction of the working class with mass democratic movements. The interrelations between political parties and labor unions and other mass labor organizations are an extremely pertinent subject today.

The party's announced objective of the careful study and generalization of the experience of the workers movement also applies completely to the study of the proletariat's struggle on the political level, especially the study and further analysis of pertinent aspects of the world communist movement. As the CPSU Program stresses, "the communist movement is the most influential ideological and political force of the present day.... Consistent adherence to class principles is heightening the prestige of communist parties, despite the fact that imperialism's politico-ideological network has been operating more and more insidiously, combining the discriminatory treatment and persecution of communists and overtly anticommunist propaganda with the support of the particular elements within the labor movement opposing class policy and international solidarity and advocating social conciliation and partnership with the bourgeoisie. The monopolist bourgeoisie and reactionary forces are attacking communists this vehemently precisely because they represent a movement with deep roots in social development, a movement expressing the most vital interests of the popular masses."¹⁵ Operating under difficult conditions, fraternal communist parties advocate the kind of escape from the capitalist crisis and the kind of solution to increasingly severe economic and sociopolitical problems that will be in the interests of the laboring public.

Proceeding from the principled instructions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the researchers of the Institute of the International Workers Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences, will redouble their efforts with the aim of the more thorough and comprehensive study of the main aspects of the development of the Soviet working class under the conditions of accelerated social progress; new tendencies in the world revolutionary process and the analysis of the role of the working class and its vanguard, the communist parties, in this process; the status and struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist world, the activities of the political and professional organizations of the laboring public, the interaction of the organized working class with mass democratic, including antiwar, movements, and so forth. A positive contribution to the more thorough study of many of these topics could result from the exchange of opinions and group discussions with Marxist researchers from various countries with the aim of the thorough consideration of new international developments, changing socioeconomic and political conditions, the directions and forms of class struggle and the development of the international solidarity of labor. There is no question that research in these fields will be of serious value in the thorough study and interpretation of major theoretical aspects of the world proletarian movement and the entire revolutionary-liberation movement, and in the practical activities of progressive labor organizations. It will be of great help to them in their active, purposeful and offensive struggle against the reactionary ideology of anticommunism and the dangerous militarist policy and their struggle for lasting peace, democracy and social progress.

FOOTNOTES

1. "CPSU Program. New Edition," PRAVDA, 7 March 1986.
2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.
4. M. S. Gorbachev, "Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress, 25 February 1986," Moscow, 1986, p 64.
5. Ibid., p 61.
6. "CPSU Program. New Edition," PRAVDA, 7 March 1986.
9. "Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 23 April 1985," Moscow, 1985, p 6.
10. For more about the main fields of activity of the Institute of the International Workers Movement and about this commission, see RABOCHIY KLAS V MIROVOM REVOLYUTSIONNOM PROTSESSE, Moscow, 1975-1986; B. I. Rasputnis, "Sovetskaya istoriografiya sovremennogo rabocheho dvizheniya" [Soviet Historical Analysis of the Contemporary Workers Movement], pts 1-2, Lvov, 1976-1980; VOPROSY ISTORII, 1978, No 6.
11. For a more detailed discussion, see, for example, M. A. Zaborov, "The History of the Workers Movement in the Capitalist Countries in Studies by Soviet Researchers (1981-1985)," NOVA'A I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, 1985, No 6, pp 3-18.
12. M. S. Gorbachev, Op. cit., p 108.
13. Ibid., pp 108-109.
14. Ibid., pp 4-5.
15. "CPSU Program. New Edition," PRAVDA, 7 March 1986.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

8588

CSO: 1807/287

TRENDS, FUTURE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTH AMERICA VIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 49-60

[Article by S. I. Semenov: "Where Is South America Heading: Trends and Prospects"; passages rendered in all capital letters printed in boldface in source]

[Text] "A distinctive feature of our time is **THE GROWTH OF MASS DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS IN THE NON-SOCIALIST WORLD....** These movements are objectively directed against the policy of reactionary imperialist groups and are part of the general struggle for social progress" ("CPSU Program. New Edition").

South America is approaching the third millenium with considerable human, material, technical and cultural potential. Its unique contribution to world literature, music, architecture and the fine arts is universally acknowledged and is constantly growing. World culture today would be unimaginable without the names of H. Villa-Lobos (Brazil) and J. Asuncion Flores (Paraguay) in music, Guayasamin (Ecuador) in painting, P. Neruda (Chile), C. Vallejo (Peru), G. Garcia Marquez (Colombia), J. L. Borges (Argentina) and M. Otero Silva (Venezuela) in literature, L. Costa and O. Niemeyer (Brazil) in architecture, J. L. Massera (Uruguay) in mathematics, etc. Now a renaissance of the unique Indian cultures is being witnessed, especially in the Andean countries.

This subregion is part of the non-socialist world. With the exception of the Guianas, 10 South American states threw off the colonial yoke at the beginning of the 19th century and have been traveling the capitalist road since then.¹ In the last decade, however, serious changes took place in these 10 states: Whereas only 2 of the countries had a civilian regime and the rest had military governments in the middle of the 1970's, now the military-fascist dictatorships still exist only in Chile and Paraguay. The political appearance of the subregion has changed noticeably.

Recent decades have been marked by positive qualitative changes in the scientific and technical potential of South America, which is still lagging behind perceptibly. The price of this progress, however, is too high--the hunger of tens of millions of its inhabitants, their vegetative state of illiteracy, the

colossal and irreversible destruction of man's environment by monopolist alliances of capitalists and latifundists, and the deaths of tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of completely innocent people as a result of the overt and covert terrorism practiced by imperialism and the local oligarchy.

Just 10 years ago almost all of the South American governments were pompously calling themselves part of "Western Christian civilization," and many were not embarrassed to publicly call themselves "vassals of the United States," but now even such truly fascist vassals of imperialism as Pinochet and Stroessner are publicly disavowing their suzerain and are striving to hide their "made-in-the-USA" labels.

In the debates on South American fascism of 10 years ago (which was called nothing other than "rightist authoritarianism" for the sake of respectability), petty bourgeois sociologists argued that South America was faced by a dilemma: It could choose between fascism or socialism, and there was no other choice. Experience has proved the accuracy of a different approach, which was recorded quite clearly in the final document of the 1975 conference of Latin American communist parties in Havana--the choice between fascism or democracy. The South American people unequivocally chose democracy. The perceptible growth of the general democratic movement, a wave which engulfed literally all of South America, even the young states (Guyana and Surinam) and countries with civilian governments (Colombia and Venezuela), distinguished the late 1970's and the 1980's. This wave is still ascending, although unevenly, temporarily ebbing and then rising even higher. It can be said that all of South America has been encompassed by the democratic process in the 1980's. Researchers, politicians, other public spokesmen, members of the democratic movement and its opponents now must consider certain questions--What is the nature of this phenomenon? What are its essential features and content? In what direction is this process developing and where could it lead South America by the end of our century? Is it similar to the revolutionary processes in Central America and the Caribbean?

There is no shortage of political works categorizing the South American democratic process either as part of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system or as part of the crisis of American neocolonialism or equating it with a revolution. The opponents and phony friends of this process are eager to view it as a confrontation either between the East and West or between the South and North.

Analysis indicates, for example, that the democratic processes in Guyana and Surinam are a logical extension of the collapse of the English and Dutch colonial systems (in the Caribbean) and a legitimate reaction to the neo-colonial policy of the United States and its NATO allies. Another important factor is the colossal foreign debt the countries of this region owe to TNC's and banks, especially North American ones, a debt which turns into an increasingly acute problem each year, compounding their instability and threatening to bring about spontaneous upheavals with unpredictable effects on world economic relations and the entire system of international relations.²

The new edition of the CPSU Program correctly stresses that the U.S. "policy of hegemonism, diktat, the imposition of unfair relations on other states, the

support of repressive undemocratic regimes and discrimination against countries displeasing the United States is disorganizing intergovernmental economic and political relations and impeding their normal development."

The export of counterrevolution by U.S. imperialism, as in the case of Chile in 1973, state terrorism and the overt piracy in Grenada in 1983 are understandably evoking a reaction from the enslaved peoples and arousing an ineradicable desire for freedom. And no iron curtain feverishly erected by the United States around the countries it enslaves, no carrier task forces or detachments of professional assassins wearing green or other berets, can stifle the growing democratic movement that could take on revolutionary overtones: Counterrevolutionary actions will sooner or later give rise to revolutionary reactions.

For this reason, all of these factors are indisputably among the causes of the growth of today's general democratic movement and are giving it a strong anti-imperialist thrust. Nevertheless, the essence of the South American general democratic process, not to mention its content, is richer and more diverse and is based on the complex interaction of internal and external factors. It has deep historical and cultural roots. This process is an element of one of the main driving forces of social development in the present era. Just as in other capitalist countries, it is engendered by the increasingly acute antagonism between monopolies and the overwhelming majority of the population.

The distinctive features of South American mass democratic movements, however, are diverse. Above all, they are directed against the bloc of foreign and local monopolies, the foreign and local financial oligarchy and its most reactionary, militarist and despotic segment.

Secondly, these movements are connected with the distinctive features of the capitalist path of development in this subregion. As mentioned above, the majority of the South American countries embarked on the path of capitalist development at the beginning of the 19th century, after the wars for independence and the separation of Brazil from Portugal. Furthermore, South America went through the same stages of capitalist development as Europe, including the phase of free competition, but it did this much later. The industrial revolution, which began in Chile, Brazil and several other countries back in the 1840's, took almost an entire century. Incomplete bourgeois-democratic reforms left the agrarian and national questions unanswered after the wars for independence. The development of capitalism in agriculture was based on the slow conversion of pre-capitalist latifundias to capitalist ones and was accompanied by the mass dispossession of peasant lands. Furthermore, the latifundists, who dealt primarily with the foreign market and invested their profits in industry, mining, trade and banking, became the local "political chiefs," the political leaders, turning their farm hands and the rest of the surrounding population economically dependent on them into their political clientele. The local executive, judicial, military and police system was under the latifundist's control. This kind of capitalist development gave the political superstructure the features of military despotism and was accompanied by the militarization of political thinking and of political culture in general. Military despotism was traditionally promoted by the embourgeoised

landowners, migrants from rural areas who lacked the features of a traditional aristocracy. This class had certain characteristic racist prejudices against laborers, who had different ethnic origins. The top officers were usually recruited from among the embourgeoised landowners. Local latifundias are now turning into large agroindustrial complexes affiliated with foreign monopolist enterprises and banks.

The development of capitalism in the majority of South American republics was based less on enclaves of foreign monopolies or government enterprises than on domestic markets. This meant that foreign capital had to adapt to the needs of domestic markets and fit into existing production relations. The concentration and centralization of production at the beginning of the 20th century and especially during and after World War II promoted the growth of local monopolies, which are now the partners of transnational corporations and banks. The local financial oligarchy which took shape in this manner has the distinct features of a cosmopolitan elite and is therefore particularly inclined to regard itself as a champion of "Western Christian civilization" and participate in its "crusades." This oligarchy is distinguished by extremely reactionary political behavior, adventurism and reliance on forceful methods of suppressing the labor movement. Acting in conjunction with the TNC's and the agroindustrial complex, it is strengthening the militarist features of the political system and military despotism. Therefore, the mass democratic movements in South America, which are directed against military despotism and against the tyrannical regimes it has engendered, are primarily anti-monopolist in essence. They oppose foreign and local monopolies and they oppose their most reactionary segment, which has involved these states in U.S. foreign policy adventures.

Thirdly, the democratic process in South America is an organic part of the world movement for peace. It is no secret that the cultivation of military-fascist and other tyrannical regimes in South America was portrayed to the public as a "crusade against communism" and was sanctified by a "national security doctrine" imported from the United States. This policy was declared to be a means of accelerating South America's socioeconomic development, but it only accelerated the arms race in this region, diverted colossal quantities of resources into it and gave rise to unprecedented inflation and the monstrous growth of the foreign debt. As the Malvinas crisis demonstrated, this doctrine actually diminished the combat capabilities of the South American armies. By converting them for the performance of police functions, it weakened the state security of these countries. The elimination of tyrannical regimes will help to strengthen the national sovereignty of South American countries, settle local conflicts by peaceful means, reduce military spending and transfer the funds thus made available to the production sphere and to social needs. International detente could give South America's development colossal momentum and stimulate the democratic process here. "Today," M. S. Gorbachev said, "huge quantities of people, half of them children, are starving or suffering from malnutrition just in Latin America. The reduction of world military spending by just 5 or 10 percent would eliminate this problem."³

Finally, perceptible changes in socioeconomic conditions and in the class structure of society in connection with the transformation of this subregion into a zone with an absolute majority of urban inhabitants lie at the basis of

the democratic process in South America. These changes are drawing workers, peasants and the large urban middle strata of the population and even the non-monopolistic segments of the local bourgeoisie, which is quite large in South America, into the general democratic movement.

The attacks of the TNC's and the local oligarchy on the civil rights and standard of living of the laboring public, led by the reactionary military establishment and sanctified by the traditionalist segment of the church hierarchy, are encountering mounting resistance. In South America, in contrast to the centers of imperialism, there has been a steady increase in the number of labor conflicts, in the number and duration of strikes and in the persistence of strikers, during the most crucial stages of recessions as well as during periods of economic recovery. For example, in Brazil the number of officially recorded labor conflicts alone quadrupled between 1980 and 1983 and the number in Ecuador increased 1.5-fold between 1974 and 1983, with the number of strikers doubling and the number of lost work days more than quadrupling. The situation in Venezuela is comparable.⁴

The workers of branches of TNC's and foreign monopolies are in the advance ranks of the strikers who are stubbornly resisting the policy of "social revenge." It is this resistance that "rocked the boat" of military-fascist and related regimes in the southern cone. The center of gravity of the democratic movement has shifted noticeably toward the cities, and not only in the southern cone, where this tendency was observed long ago, but also in the Andean countries--Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. For example, the general strikes of 13 November 1975, 18 May 1977 and 13 May 1981 in Ecuador aided in the satisfaction of immediate economic needs. Labor also demanded a democratic agrarian reform and the nationalization of oil.⁵ The battles of the working class, supported by white-collar workers, the progressive intelligentsia and clergymen with democratic views, forced the dominant classes in Ecuador to liberalize the political regime. A constitution bearing the imprint of the democratic demands of the masses was adopted.

This is all the more important in view of the clearly defined authoritarian features of political regimes in South America. One of Brazil's renowned lawyers, Julio Teixeira, correctly noted that even the 1946 constituent assembly, the most democratic in the country's history (since then there has not been a single assembly in Brazil), "worked behind closed doors."⁶

The long reign of latifundism and clericalism, the dominant position of foreign and local monopolies with their politically reactionary tendencies and the mass illiteracy of the population led to a situation in which the constitutionally declared bourgeois-democratic freedoms have actually taken the form of political clientelism, corporativism and the civic passivity of the majority of voters.

The late 1970's and early 1980's were marked by the growth of democratic processes in South America, changing the political spectrum of the subregion as a whole. Although the U.S. military-industrial complex and its local allies were able to dismantle the zone of active opposition to imperialism in South America by the middle of the 1970's and to cultivate military-fascist

and other tyrannical regimes here, they were incapable of consolidating them. Successes in the construction of socialism in Cuba and the victory of the popular Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua, which did away with the oldest tyrannical regime in Latin America, forced on the people by the U.S. Marines, provided strong momentum for changes and paved the way for stronger independence, progressive democracy and social renewal. The new upsurge of the general democratic movement began to push the products of West Point and other American schools out of one presidential easy-chair after another.

One of the distinctive features of the general democratic movement of the 1970's and 1980's is the leading role of the working class, especially the workers of the "new" dynamic sectors of industry, employed at the enterprises of TNC's and in the state sector, and the urban poor. The socioeconomic policy of the tyrannical regimes, based on the neoliberal model of the "Chicago school" and the recommendations of the IMF, is also being resisted. The ineffectiveness of the tyrannical regimes is alienating even those who put them in power--the TNC's and the oligarchic groups associated with them. The latter are concentrating on a search for a "social pact" similar to the Spanish Moncloa Pact as a more effective means of accumulating profits and debts than mass repression. The preference now given to the liberalization of political regimes (incidentally, without any dismantling of the repressive militarist and paramilitarist institutions) is compulsory. Wherever the movement from below is not organized or strong enough, tyranny is still being upheld--for example, in Chile, Paraguay and so forth. Therefore, the above-mentioned liberalization can be regarded as a by-product of the mass democratic patriotic movement.

Communists, who initiated the policy of broad democratic, anti-dictatorial, antifascist and patriotic coalitions and alliances, are in the vanguard of democratic processes in South America. The leading role in these alliances is played by leftist-socialist and radical-democratic parties and groups and populist-nationalist movements and parties. The Socialist International is working closely with many of them. These parties and movements advocate Latin American solidarity and integration, the institution of long-overdue socioeconomic and political reforms and more active participation by their countries in the struggle for peace and international cooperation.⁷ The nationalist populist parties and movements head governments or participate in them in the largest South American countries and have considerable influence in almost all of the other states in this zone. The strength and irreversibility of the tendency toward the democratization of South America and the reinforcement of its role in the world community will depend on the successful interaction of these movements with communists.

Other public organizations and institutions are also important to this system of alliances, including democratic members of the military establishment, progressive religious organizations, associations of the progressive intelligentsia and student groups. Patriotic and democratic soldiers and clergymen opposing the North American "national security" doctrine and the reactionary policies of John Paul II's pontificate can make and are making an important contribution to the democratic process. The courageous actions of the democratic military organization of Argentina, opposing the fascist conspirators in defense of national sovereignty, are noteworthy in this context. They are

consistently upholding the traditions of the "May revolution" of 1910, which marked the beginning of the country's independence. The armed forces are being purged of criminal and corrupt elements and are being democratized in Argentina, Bolivia and Peru, although this process is being severely impeded by the local oligarchy and U.S. military missions in these countries. The obstacles impeding the democratization of the Catholic Church hierarchy are even more substantial. This process, which was being conducted successfully in a number of South American countries in the 1960's and 1970's, has been stopped. In the 1980's the "Opus Dei" took the counteroffensive here and acquired stronger influence in many countries (Colombia, Ecuador and others) with the support of the Reagan Administration and local oligarchic groups.⁸

Recognition of the services rendered by communists in the struggle for the democratization of politics and the reinforcement of national sovereignty has taken the form of the reinstatement of their right of legal participation in election campaigns. The dominant classes here prohibited political participation by communists just three decades ago, on the basis of anticommunist legislation imposed on South America according to the McCarthy model. Even a decade ago the communist parties participated legally in elections to legislative bodies in only three South American states, but now they have won this right in nine countries. They are continuing their underground struggle in two countries (Chile and Paraguay), whereas just 10 years ago communist party membership was sufficient grounds for the arrest and even the execution of people in at least six South American states.

Of course, the brutal terrorist behavior to which the South American labor movement was subjected in the early 1970's by the U.S. military machine and its military-fascist satellites had, and is still having, an adverse effect on politics, on the organization of the proletariat and on the membership of trade unions and communist parties. But neither terrorism nor subversive operations from within have helped imperialism and its proteges destroy a single communist party; all of them, in spite of irretrievable losses, are continuing their courageous struggle against imperialism and oligarchy, remaining loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The conference of South American communist parties in Buenos Aires (Argentina) in July 1984 was important in coordinating the efforts of communists. The communist parties, which have made such a substantial contribution to the dismantling of military dictatorships, have virtually regained their position among the masses and have even been able to establish coalitions of leftist forces in many countries and to win impressive support in elections to representative bodies on the national, regional and local levels and in extra-parliamentary undertakings.

The shift toward political reaction on all levels, accompanying the transition from the pre-monopolist stage to imperialism, strengthened the authoritarian features of the political superstructure in South America and intensified its militarization. In this subregion, the general crisis of capitalism is primarily eroding this authoritarian superstructure and is giving rise to strong democratic mass movements, in which the leading role is played by the working class and its political parties.

The socialist revolution in Cuba and the processes in Central America are having a strong influence on the general democratic movement in South America and are arousing serious worries in bourgeois groups of the subregion about the future of the existing order. There has been some regrouping of class forces within this movement, the diversification of its social content, the clarification of its goals and the methods and means of their attainment, the inclusion of new segments in the movement, the withdrawal of some groups and even the transfer of some to the adversary position. This regrouping of forces has been most apparent in the Andean countries (Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador), where authoritarian behavior and power politics have won increasing support from the entrepreneurial elite and its bureaucratic associates. It could be said that the democratic movements in these countries are moving into the depths, appealing to the segments of the popular masses that did not participate actively in politics in the past. The "civilian strikes" (the cessation of work by all enterprises and establishments in a specific city and the active boycotting of the entire existing regime) are proof of the intensification and radicalization of the democratic movement, which cannot and will not confine itself any longer to passive participation in elections.

Democratic forces in the South American countries are now not only demanding the reinstatement of the authority of representative establishments, but also the removal of fascist elements from the government, especially repressive agencies, the democratization of daily life on the level of enterprises, establishments, urban neighborhoods and rural communities, the democratization of the mass media, participation by labor in the management of enterprises, the democratization of the internal workings of public organizations, especially trade unions and cooperatives, the granting of civil rights to the Indian population, the cessation of discrimination against Indians and participation by the masses in domestic and foreign policymaking. In this way, the democratic movement is transcending the bounds of the existing order in its demands and is emerging beyond the confines of bourgeois democracy (which does not even exist on the level of social practice and is only advertised in formal but not necessarily enforced acts; it could be said that the actually functioning institutions in this subregion are inconsistent with the ideals and standards of bourgeois democracy and that their activities are usually undemocratic, even in the bourgeois sense of the term). The mass democratic movements in South America also have a clear anti-imperialist thrust and are opposing the dictates of the IMF, the aggressive policy of the U.S. administration and, in particular, the undeclared war it started against Nicaragua. Over the long range, these movements hope to establish a new and higher type of developed democratic regime.

The development of the democratic process in South America, however, has not been uniform. In ARGENTINA, the Communist Party initiated the creation of an extremely broad multipartisan coalition advocating the democratization of the political regime as early as 1976, immediately after the reactionary military coup.⁹ In 1981 the coalition drew up a program, and in 1982 it drafted a plan of emergency measures and mobilized the masses in support of it. This contributed to the isolation and eventual fall of the military dictatorship. It is true that the pressure exerted by the U.S. embassy, the local oligarchy

and rightwing military and church groups led to the collapse of the coalition, preventing the genuine and comprehensive democratization of the country, but the parliamentary elections of November 1985 proved that the "Popular Front," formed with the decisive participation of the Communist Party, had won perceptible support from the working class, especially in the industrial belt. It won 352,000 votes (including 201,000 in Buenos Aires Province), an increase of 60 percent over 1983.¹⁰ The election results are contributing to the regrouping of political forces in Argentina, the elimination of the unstable bipartisan "model" and the creation of a system of broad political alliances of democratic patriotic forces to counteract the destabilizing efforts of U.S. imperialism and its oligarchic partners and pave the way for a truly democratic regime based on a national policy in the interests of the general public.

The Communist Party of URUGUAY, which played a decisive part in the elimination of the military-fascist regime, wants to expand democracy by mobilizing the masses in a struggle for a program of social and economic demands.¹¹ There is the possibility of the advancement of a popular government headed by the Broad Front, the possibility of an anti-imperialist and patriotic government. The aim of this concept of "democratic offensive" is "progressive democracy." Furthermore, the movement for a democratic consensus as a form of class struggle and a means of winning, consolidating and stabilizing democratic gains and peace is closely related to the struggle for strategic goals. And the most active force in all of this is the working class.¹²

The unification of leftist parties and organizations in PERU and the creation of a coalition of leftist forces, with the Communist Party as its invariable connecting link, contributed to a substantial leftward shift in national politics. The decisive role in this was played by the militant demonstrations of the working class, supported by the entire laboring public. They frustrated the attempts of rightwing military leaders to establish a terrorist regime in the country and forced them to retreat and to turn their power over to a civilian government. The mounting strikes by blue- and white-collar workers and the general strikes of 22 March and 29 November 1984, organized by the General Confederation of Peruvian Workers and based on the united actions of the country's four central labor organizations, kept oligarchic, pro-imperialist groups from gaining a firm position in the government.¹³ Although the leftist coalition did not win the 1985 presidential elections and came in second after the APRA [American Popular Revolutionary Alliance], it was the mobilization of the masses by the leftist coalition on the basis of a democratic and anti-imperialist platform that led to the democratization of Peruvian politics.

The process of surmounting the lack of unity of democratic forces has encountered considerable difficulties in COLOMBIA, where centers of partisan struggle have been smoldering since the late 1940's as a result of intervention by North American imperialism and the terrorism of latifundists and other oligarchic groups. The attempts of internal and external reactionaries to establish a military-fascist regime were frustrated by a powerful movement for the democratization of politics, the establishment of civil peace and the institution of long-overdue socioeconomic and political reforms. The deciding

role in this general democratic movement was played by the working class, headed by the Communist Party. The first experimental joint undertaking by workers and middle strata was the civil strike held on 14 September 1977 at the suggestion of the Confederation of Colombian Workers with the participation of other trade unions; the general strikes of 13 May and 21 October 1981, the subsequent strike of 24 October 1984 and the "third national general strike" on 20 June 1985 were important milestones in the prevention of a military coup and in the talks on the democratization of politics. The patriotic alliance is growing stronger and has become the nucleus of the united leftist organizations.¹⁴ Ultra-rightist and ultra-leftist groups and segments of the reactionary military establishment and church hierarchy have made every effort to stop this process.

In BOLIVIA and BRAZIL, the working class, especially communists, played an outstanding role in dismantling the military tyrannical regimes and restoring the elementary civil liberties. The lack of leftist unity in these countries precluded the kind of perceptible results in political democratization that were witnessed in Argentina and Uruguay, but the communist parties nevertheless acquired the chance to participate legally in politics (in Bolivia their members have already participated in government activity).

The communists of PARAGUAY and, in particular, of CHILE, where military-fascist regimes still exist, have encountered even greater difficulties in the efforts to unite leftist forces. The lack of unity among anti-fascist democratic forces in these countries, nurtured by the anticommunist prejudices of a still substantial part of the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie and the middle strata, along with U.S. imperialism's interference in the internal affairs of these states, is the cause of the artificial delays in the death throes of their military-fascist regimes. It is precisely the working class of Chile, led by its experienced Marxist-Leninist vanguard, that is bearing most of the burden of confrontations with fascist tyranny and is making the greatest sacrifices for the triumph of the democratic cause. The days of national protest since May 1983 and the mounting strikes, including the first national strike of 30 October 1984, attest to this. In Chile the situation is growing increasingly tense. There are signs that the last prop of the Pinochet dictatorship, the army, is cracking and that the ability to resist mass public demonstrations with military force is waning, despite the intensification of fascist terror. A broad democratic popular front was formed in Paraguay in 1985.

American imperialism, other imperialist centers and the local financial oligarchy have displayed increasing worries about the escalation of social and political tension in this subregion. Various imperialist groups have proposed different ways of emerging from the mounting crisis in the capitalist system. Some have been seeking recipes for the so-called modernization of capitalism in this region, its "Westernization" and the creation of "interdependent structures" for a long time, since the beginning of the 1930's. Moreover, they have argued that the crisis is due to the "strain of modernization," that it is a "crisis of change" and a sign of growth and of transition from the "traditional society" to modern capitalism,¹⁵ and have emphasized the importance of the gradual reconstruction of the existing system from the top down, placing their hopes in the social democratic "third path."

Others, such as J. Kirkpatrick, former permanent U.S. representative to the United Nations and Reagan's adviser, reject the reformist recipes. After analyzing the upsetting results of the 1970's for monopolies, she demanded the assignment of priority in U.S. policy in this region to the protection of the interests of North American "private business" and insisted on the unrestricted export of profits, on guarantees for private capital investments and on the denationalization of enterprises in the state sector. In her opinion, "democratic regimes" will be unable to do this. Kirkpatrick believes that brutality is an integral part of the political system in this zone and that coups, conspiracies and military regimes are the political norm. Without beating around the bush, she expresses a preference for the "hierarchical method of classifying citizens" and for active participation by the military in the exercise of political power and its personification.¹⁶ Proceeding from geopolitical concepts, she views all of Latin America as a natural sphere of U.S. influence and wants a return to the situation of the late 1940's and early 1950's, when U.S. ruling circles tried to isolate Latin America from the rest of the world with an "iron curtain" to the accompaniment of the "cold war," cultivated the most brutal tyranny there and started civil wars, the effects of which are still being felt in such countries as Guatemala and Colombia. These recipes were set forth in the "Santa Fe Document," prepared for R. Reagan by a group of rightwing Republicans. The proposals did not stand the test of time: The military fascist dictators revealed all of their incompetence.

Now the Reagan Administration is seeking ways of expanding the social base of American imperialism in South America. It is employing something like a regional "Marshall Plan" (to attain the same strategic goals with slightly different methods and also to involve this zone in NATO and in the "Star Wars" program), the anticommunist prejudices of the South American bourgeoisie and its fear of the popular Nicaraguan revolution. It wants the bourgeoisie and the middle strata to submit to a policy line dictated by pan-American supranational business organizations, such as the Inter-American Trade and Production Council, the Council of the Americas and other such organizations. These supranational institutions, created by TNC's and the local oligarchy, are beginning to play an increasingly perceptible role in South American politics. For example, the third conference of Argentine private banks (with foreign banks participating) wholeheartedly supported the policy of freezing wages and of transferring the entire burden of "modernization" to the shoulders of labor, a policy made in line with IMF recommendations.¹⁷ Imperialism is hoping for a rightward shift of the political axis and for the spread of the "two-party swing" model to South America (populist-reformist ersatz "social democracy" and a conservative social-Christian or even pro-fascist political entity such as the National Party in Chile or the Alsogaraya group in Argentina). To this end, it is also exploiting the anti-statist prejudices (of bourgeois and petty bourgeois groups) that are cultivated by the mass media, monopolized by the oligarchy. A vivid example of this is the pretentious opus by the renowned Venezuelan rightwing correspondent M. Granier.¹⁸

To carry out this strategic plan, imperialism must put leftist forces out of commission, especially the communist and worker parties. For this reason, part of the plan entails attempts to split the communist parties from within

and then break up the leftist democratic coalitions. Unfortunately, imperialism has been able to enlist the support of petty bourgeois nationalists with glib leftist rhetoric, such as Jose Arico or Carlos Franco. Carlos Franco, the famous advocate of so-called Latin-Americanized Marxism, proposed a far-fetched scheme based on the "theory of modernization," alleging that the anti-imperialist strategy (the origins of which he dates back to the 1920's) supposedly corresponds to the enclave period of the dominion of mining and oil corporations and is not applicable to the period of the financial and industrial dominion of TNC's and banks over dependent countries (Franco defines this period as the 1970's and 1980's).¹⁹ Furthermore, Franco deliberately vulgarizes the views of Latin American Marxist-Leninists of the 1920's by reducing their proposed anti-imperialist strategy to the nationalization of foreign enclaves. As we know, J. C. Mariategui, V. Codovilla, A. Pereira, J. A. Meglia and other leaders of the young Latin American communist parties proved that this measure was inadequate in their arguments with petty bourgeois nationalists. They associated the success of the anti-imperialist struggle not with isolated superficial measures against certain monopolies (these progressive measures did not eliminate imperialist domination but merely changed the forms of imperialist rule), but, proceeding from Lenin's theory of imperialism, with the institution of radical socioeconomic and political reforms, with an eventual socialist future. For several objective and subjective reasons, these plans, with rare exceptions, were not implemented in the 1920's. Some of the experience of the 1930's and the great experiment in the consistent construction of a socialist society in Cuba, however, cogently proved the accuracy of the Marxist-Leninist anti-imperialist strategy.

The attempts of petty bourgeois nationalists and supporters of "Latin-Americanized Marxism" to deny the role of the working class and its parties in the anti-imperialist movement are certainly not new. Even 20 years ago, North American sociologist E. Halperin categorically declared that "the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution, carried out by the working class, is not applicable to Latin America."²⁰ As proof of this, he cited the impossibility of organizing the working class as a whole and said that the segments of this class which could be organized were "not at all revolutionary." For this reason, Halperin proposed reliance on the "middle class" and on nationalism instead of on the working class and Marxism. The experience of 1970-1973, the experience of Popular Unity in Chile proved, however, that the working class could be organized on a revolutionary basis and that the industrial working class, guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, was the main generator of the revolutionary process. This experience clearly revealed the vacillation of the middle strata between the revolutionary working class and the counter-revolutionary oligarchy, vacillation used by the oligarchy and foreign imperialism to accomplish the military-fascist coup in Chile. Furthermore, nationalism was the counterrevolutionary bait that caught the vacillating middle strata. It is obvious that a conflict over nationalism between the working class and the middle strata, constituting the majority of the population of Latin America along with the urban poor, could help imperialism in carrying out its strategic plan. What the situation actually calls for is the liberation of these strata and the non-monopolistic bourgeois groups affiliated with them from the influence of the oligarchic bloc and the consequent redirection of all South American politics into the channel of democratization, stronger national sovereignty and an independent and peaceful foreign policy line.

Colombian Conservative Party presidential candidate Alvaro Gomez asserts in his speeches that the armed brutality in his country was not engendered by the policy of imperialism and the financial-landowner oligarchy, but by the "disruption of the ecological balance," and declares that the erection of powerful hydraulic systems will bring about a genuine social revolution in the country.²¹ Obviously, for Colombia and for the rest of South America, the authoritarian behavior of TNC's has truly catastrophic implications and will inflict irreparable damages on the population of this subregion and on the entire planet by destroying its "lungs"--the jungles of the Amazon, Orinoco and La Plata basins--and by disrupting the global ecological balance. It is completely obvious, however, that the predatory activities of TNC's in this zone cannot be restricted without revolutionary measures. Therefore, social revolution is not simply a matter of building hydraulic systems, but is a prerequisite for the real resolution of the most urgent socioeconomic and political problems as well as ecological and demographic problems. This kind of revolution must become the culminating point of the current democratic processes in the zone.

In a number of forecasts, the South America of the end of the second millenium is portrayed as another new center of the capitalist system. In others, it is assigned a non-capitalist course of development. These tendencies actually do exist, but the forecasts, as the experience of the 1970's and early 1980's proved, are probable only in the form of exceptions--for example, Brazil, which is turning into an industrial power, in the first case, and some Caribbean countries in the second. In our opinion, it is already too late for the second tendency to be realized in South America (the military radicals in Peru insisted on the "non-capitalist path," but the attempts to carry out this plan revealed its completely utopian nature and the absence of any kind of mass support for it), and foreign economic conditions are extremely unfavorable for the continuation of the first tendency. Neither transformation into an industrially developed capitalist power nor the "introduction of socialism" is on today's agenda. On the contrary, there is only the prospect of advancement toward socialism through the necessary transitional democratic processes.

The democratic processes which have been taking place in South America in the 1980's and are being upheld by the energetic activity of the working class, the urban middle strata and the peasantry are helping to strengthen and augment the independent role of this subregion in contemporary international relations. The broader participation of South American countries in the non-aligned movement (they previously remained aloof from it), the creation of the world's first nuclear-free zone in this subregion, the collective actions in favor of a political settlement in Central America and against the militarization of the south Atlantic, and the participation of governments of some South American countries in a number of progressive and important international initiatives against the arms race and for the reduction of nuclear stockpiles, the prevention of the militarization of space and the establishment of a new economic and informational order are all signs of positive changes detected in this zone in the last decade. The expanding scales of the diplomatic, economic, scientific, technical and cultural cooperation by the USSR and other socialist countries with almost all of the South American countries (with the exception of Paraguay and Chile) also attest to a prevailing tendency toward an independent foreign policy line and to the desire of these countries to make a

contribution to the improvement of the international situation and the democratization of international economic relations on a fair and mutually beneficial basis.

South America is on the threshold of profound changes in socioeconomic structures, in the political superstructure, in public opinion and in culture. The South Americans have reason to look to the future with optimism and make a substantial contribution to lasting international peace and cooperation.

FOOTNOTES

1. Guyana and Surinam won state independence a relatively short time ago. French Guiana is still a colony.
2. See "The Soviet-American Summit Meeting. Geneva. 19-21 November 1985," Moscow, 1985, p 28.
3. Ibid., p 36.
4. "Yearbook of Labor Statistics. 1984," Geneva, 1984, p 827; G. Farrel, "Mercado de trabajo urbano y el movimiento sindical," Quito, 1982.
5. "Partido Comunista del Ecuador. X Congreso," Guayaquil, 1984, p 21.
6. VOZ DE UNIDADE, Sao Paulo, 3-9 August 1985.
7. T. Meyer, "El socialismo democratico," Bonn, 1982, pp 122-123, 131.
8. CONTROVERSIA, Bogota, 1985, No 127, pp 39-41.
9. F. Nadra, "Por que un frente? A cerca del Frente de liberacion nacional y social," Buenos Aires, 1984, p 51.
10. EL PERIODISTA DE BUENOS AIRES, Buenos Aires, 1985, No 61, p 6.
11. OPINION, Montevideo, 23 March 1985.
12. H. Martorelli, "Transición a la democracia," Montevideo, 1984.
13. UNIDAD, Lima, 20 December 1984.
14. N. Buenaventura, "Clases y partidos en Colombia," Bogota, 1984.
15. "Latin American Modernization Problems. Case Studies in the Crises of Change," Chicago, 1973, pp 5-7; G. Plaza, "Latin America Today and Tomorrow," Wash., 1971, p 14.
16. "American Enterprise Studies in Foreign Policy. Rift and Revolution," Wash., 1984, pp 339-340.

17. CLARIN, Buenos Aires, 27 August 1985.
18. M. Granier, "La generacion de relevo vs. el Estado omnipotente," Caracas, 1984.
19. SOCIALISMO Y PARTICIPACION, Lima, 1985, No 29, p 3.
20. E. Halperin, "Nationalism and Communism in Chile," Cambridge, 1965, p 21.
21. LA REPUBLICA, Bogota, 23 September 1985.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

8588

CSO: 1807/287

ROUNDTABLE: SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL REVOLUTION, UNEMPLOYMENT

[Editorial Report] Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian Number 2, February 1986, carries on pp 76-88 a 10,200-word report (Part I, Part II follows in next issue) on a recent roundtable, date and place not specified, entitled "The Scientific-Technical Revolution and Problems of Unemployment in Developed Capitalist Countries." The roundtable was carried out as a "scientific discussion" at a joint session of the Academic Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement [IMRD] and the Section "The Role of the Working Class and Its Organizations in the Socioeconomic Development of Society" of the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council for the Comprehensive Problem "Economic Laws for the Development of Socialism and the Competition of Two Systems."

Participants in the roundtable included: A. I. Belchuk, professor and deputy director of IMRD; S. V. Mikhaylov, senior scientific associate of IMRD; Yu. S. Begma, sector chief at IMRD; A. M. Rumyantsev, academician, bureau member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economic Department; A. A. Galkin, professor, department chief at IMRD; R. I. Kapelyushnikov, senior researcher, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations [IMEMO]; N. D. Gauzner, chief researcher at IMEMO; G. G. Pirogov, sector chief at IMRD; V. I. Martsinkevich, IMEMO chief researcher; and A. Ye. Shulyukin, junior scientific associate of the laboratory for problems of economic integration of countries of Western Europe of the Economic Department of Moscow State University.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

CSO: 1807/287

'SOCIAL CHARACTER' OF HUNGER PROBLEM, ITS SOLUTION STRESSED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 145-155

[Article by L. A. Knyazhinskaya: "Capitalism and the Problem of Hunger in the Emerging Countries"; passages rendered in all capital letters printed in bold-face in source]

[Text] "Imperialism is to blame for the huge and growing gap between the levels of economic development in the industrial capitalist countries and the majority of emerging states and for the continued existence of vast zones of hunger, poverty and epidemic diseases on earth" ("CPSU Program. New Edition").

In 1948 the Universal Declaration on Human Rights was adopted in the United Nations, the most representative international forum. It recognized the right of each individual to a standard of living sufficient for the maintenance of health and well-being, including primarily the right to food.¹

It has been almost 40 years since that time, but it must be said that even today hundreds of millions of people are denied the right to nourishment in the capitalist world. According to the data of the FAO, a specialized UN organization concerned with food and agricultural problems, more than a billion people exist in a state of constant and acute hunger, undernourishment or malnutrition, and most of them live "on the periphery" of the capitalist world, in the emerging countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Furthermore, there has been a tendency toward an increase in the number of people suffering from various types of food shortages and diseases caused or complicated by them. The situation is paradoxical because hunger and malnutrition in the world have taken on the most massive scales in the era of the rapid growth of world productive forces, at a time when outstanding scientific and technical achievements, including achievements in food production, have established the fundamental possibility of eliminating this problem and providing all people on earth with sufficient supplies of food for the first time in human history.

The causes of hunger in the developing countries and the means of surmounting this problem are the subject of a fierce ideological and political struggle in the international arena. In arguments with bourgeois and reformist theorists,

researchers taking a Marxist-Leninist stand defend the thesis that the mass hunger in the era of technological revolution is of a social nature and is a result and a symptom of deep-seated antagonistic contradictions in the world capitalist system. Mankind's present need to eliminate hunger can quite justifiably be categorized as one of the tasks V. I. Lenin was referring to when he wrote: "Wherever you look, you can see tasks mankind is completely capable of accomplishing WITHOUT DELAY. But capitalism is standing in the way of this."² As the experience of many young emerging countries demonstrates, the capitalist course of development is incapable of leading the popular masses in these countries out of the vicious circle of underdevelopment, poverty and hunger.

The severity of the food crisis on the periphery of the capitalist world is reflected in the acute shortage of calories and of the basic nutritive substances, especially animal protein. The per capita calorie intake in the industrially developed capitalist countries is 1.5 times as high as the figure in the developing world, and the protein content is two or three times as great. The gradual widening of this gap attests to the intensification of the uneven development of the two groups of states in the world capitalist economy in the sphere of food production and consumption, just as in other economic spheres.

The main thing, however, is that the per capita food consumption level in the "Third World," even with the dramatic increase in food imports, is far from consistent with the standards of physiological nutritional requirements. The group of the least economically developed agrarian Afro-Asian countries, where the calorie intake falls far below these standards, is in this grave state.

Systematic per capita underconsumption on the national level--that is, an absolute physical shortage of food--in developing countries with sharp property and social contrasts signifies massive and chronic hunger among the poorest population strata. According to FAO estimates, the total number of people suffering from acute hunger was 400 million at the beginning of the 1970's, had already approached 500 million in 1980 and probably ranged from 600 million to 700 million in 1984 and 1985 in connection with the critical food situation in Africa.³ It must be said that the criterion of hunger in this estimate is its extreme form, determined by the "critical level" of the organism's energy requirements, sufficient only for survival. If a less rigid approach is taken to the definition of hunger, the number of hungry in the developing countries would be even higher. The food situation is severe because hunger in the emerging countries is not only a massive phenomenon, but also a constant one, a daily fact of life for broad population strata.

To comprehend the nature of hunger as a social phenomenon, it is important to bear in mind that it takes two different forms--"covert" (or chronic) and "overt"--brief periods of mass hunger as a result of poor harvests or crop failures caused by natural disasters or military conflicts. The first form--chronic hunger stemming from poverty and the consequent extremely low purchasing power of the masses--is something like an "invisible" crisis, resulting in constant physical deprivations for hundreds of millions of people in

several successive generations. Chronic hunger has become an integral feature of the way of life of much of the population of the developing countries, deprived of the elementary means of subsistence. It is a paradox that the producers of food--peasants with little or no land, tenant farmers and agricultural workers--are suffering from hunger and malnutrition. Crushed by need, they are incapable of producing or purchasing enough food to feed themselves and their families. The colossal army of partially or completely unemployed in urban and rural areas, numbering over 500 million people, according to ILO estimates, in the developing world, is also subject to hunger.⁴

Chronic hunger inflicts irreparable damages on the people of the emerging countries by shortening the average life span and keeping the mortality rate high.⁵ The exact scales of death from chronic hunger are difficult to calculate because it is usually not the immediate cause of death, but acts indirectly, undermining the health of people and lowering their resistance to various severe illnesses. Under the conditions of constant mass hunger and malnutrition, the reproduction of labor resources--the main productive force in society--"falls into decay," in K. Marx' words.⁶ This reduces the ability of people to participate effectively in the modern production process, which constantly makes higher demands on the quality of manpower.

The "covert" form of hunger, which does not depend on the size of the harvest or the state of the national food supply, quite clearly indicates the social roots of this inherent problem of the exploitative societies. Problems arising in connection with the "covert" form of hunger are usually not discussed by the bourgeois mass media: They prefer to say nothing about "social" hunger, particularly since it also exists in the economically developed capitalist countries.

The bourgeois press is always eager, however, to discuss the other, "overt" form of hunger--its local outbreaks, caused directly by natural disasters and climatic extremes (floods, lengthy droughts, cyclones, dust storms and so forth) or by devastation in times of war, coups and other extraordinary events leading to the sharp decline of agricultural production or the complete destruction of crops. It is significant that the underlying social causes of hunger can also be discerned in these "overt" forms when hunger is the result of natural disasters. The general economic underdevelopment and the extremely low level of development of productive forces in agriculture in the emerging countries make this sector highly vulnerable and helpless against the forces of nature. The more frequent disruptions of the ecological balance as a result of the predatory treatment of natural resources and the increased demographic pressure on land resources are contributing to more frequent crop failures and expanding the boundaries of the crisis zone.

Although the effects of poor harvests and crop failures as the direct causes of mass hunger in many developing countries have been neutralized to some extent in their years of independence by special measures taken on the governmental level (the creation of food reserves, the augmentation of food imports, the expansion of the state network of food distribution, etc.) and emergency international assistance, outbreaks of hunger are still taking a heavy toll. Death from hunger is acquiring particularly catastrophic dimensions, and the

"invisible" crisis is becoming obvious and is attracting the attention of the world public. In the second half of the 20th century the entire developing world has been in this critical state more than once. During the most severe and most widespread food crisis of 1972-1974, difficulties in agricultural production due to extremely unfavorable weather conditions in many countries coincided with the severe economic recession in the world capitalist economy. Hunger and its attendant diseases took the lives of millions of people in those years.

New severe outbreaks of mass hunger as a result of poor harvests occurred in the late 1970's and early 1980's, when the suffering countries included India, Bangladesh, Uganda, Kenya, northeastern Brazil, Mexico and some others. The most serious outbreaks, however, have been witnessed in Africa in the last 2 years as a result of the unprecedented lengthy and severe drought. This threatened 150 million people (or around a third of the entire African population) with hunger in more than 20 countries on the continent.⁷ Again, just as in the first half of the 1970's, the drought was not the principal or only cause of hunger. This calamity is closely related to the intensification of crisis-related phenomena in the capitalist economy, the growing foreign debt of the developing states, which has reached the astronomical sum of a trillion dollars, declining demand for the agricultural products they export, the rising prices of Western manufactured goods, the domination of their economies by transnational corporations, the reduction of Western allocations for agricultural development programs, etc.

The frequent repetition of outbreaks of mass hunger in years with poor harvests, combined with the chronic forms of hunger and malnutrition characteristic of "normal" years, attest to the extreme severity of the food problem in the developing world and to the need for decisive measures to solve it.

In the struggle against hunger, it is important to consider the distinctive features of the food crisis and the complex and difficult nature of this problem. It reveals the closest dialectical interaction of many diverse factors: social, economic, political, demographic, agrarian-technological, climatic, resource, ecological and cultural-ethnic. All of these factors, combined in different ways in different countries and regions, affect the state of food production, exchange, distribution and consumption. The complexity of the food problem stems from the fact that it is the result of the development of two different but interrelated systems of relations. One consists of the relations between the human society and its environment as the natural basis of food production (the "man-nature" system), and the other consists of the social relations between people in the process of the production of food and other means of existence and their subsequent distribution among members of society (the "man-society" system).⁸

Bourgeois ideologists worried about the social implications of the explosive intensification of the food crisis on the periphery of the capitalist world advanced theories in which biological and other natural factors were assigned priority among the causes of hunger. The most popular views are those explaining the causes of hunger from the neo-Malthusian position of demographic determinism. Today's followers of Malthus assert that the main cause

of the food crisis in the developing countries is the rapid growth of their population since the middle of the 1950's--the "population explosion." This phenomenon, in turn, is given a onesided interpretation as a purely biological phenomenon, as the desire of "human individuals" to multiply for the sake of survival. The causes of the aggressive degradation of the environment in the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries are connected with population growth, and statements are made about the demographic and ecological causes of hunger. Hunger, in their opinion, is the fault of the hungry. This approach is essentially unscientific, politically reactionary and counterproductive because it oversimplifies the multidimensional nature of the food crisis, does not reveal its social origins and diverts attention from the class and anti-imperialist struggle by putting emphasis on the demographic policy of "family planning."⁹

Marxist-Leninist social science refutes neo-Malthusianism with the argument that the pitiful food supply of the people in the young independent states is not the result of unfavorable demographic or natural factors (they can only compound the hunger problem, but cannot engender it), but of the social conditions of the world capitalist system, the development of which is connected by history with the fate of its former colonial possessions. The social-class approach to the food crisis is based on K. Marx' methodologically important statement that "the consumption of products is determined by the social conditions of the consumers, and these conditions are based on class antagonism."¹⁰

There are three groups of basic causes of the present critical food situation in the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries. The first group is of a historical nature and stems from the heavy burden these countries inherited from their colonial past, their general underdevelopment and, above all, their economic underdevelopment. The second group stems from the inclusion of the developing countries in the world capitalist economy and the continuation of the imperialist exploitation of their material and human resources with modern neocolonial methods under the conditions of continued economic dependence. The third group is connected with the social cost of the development of capitalist production relations in the economies of the emerging countries, resulting in the intensification of class antagonism and the impoverishment of the masses.

The origins of the current severe food crisis in the emerging countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America date back to the earlier colonial history of these countries. The widespread hunger and malnutrition in Asia, Africa and Latin America are among the most tragic consequences of colonialism. After establishing its vast colonial system, imperialism began the systematic and predatory exploitation of the natural and labor resources of its colonies and semicolonies. It confined the development of productive forces to the predominant sector of the economy in the enslaved countries, agriculture, and gave it a onesided, single-crop specialization, intended to satisfy the needs of mother countries instead of the needs of the enslaved people. This severely deformed the entire process of reproduction in the colonial countries, impeded their social and economic progress, gave rise to backwardness and caused the ruin and impoverishment of the multimillion-strong masses. This established the socioeconomic prerequisites for mass hunger, which was a

characteristic feature of the entire age of colonialism. Of course, the colonizers did not "invent" or "introduce" hunger. It existed even before their arrival as a symptom of the underdevelopment of the productive forces of pre-capitalist structures, attesting to the helplessness of people against the forces of nature. But colonialism compounded this problem, augmented its scales and thereby complicated the struggle for its elimination after the former colonies had won their independence.

The collapse of imperialism's colonial system, the liberation of millions of people from direct foreign domination and their achievement of political sovereignty were tremendous victories for the national liberation movement. The continued economic dependence of the majority of emerging countries on their former mother countries within the world capitalist system, however, led to the continued and sometimes intensified exploitation of these states with neocolonial methods.

The economic dependence of the former colonies on the centers of imperialism, their inclusion in the world capitalist economy, subject to various types of crises, the neocolonial exploitation of the resources of these countries, the colossal growth of their financial debts and the continuous economic, political and military "sanctions" imposed on them by imperialist powers are keeping them from surmounting their underdevelopment, especially in the agrarian sector, and are complicating the resolution of the food problem. As M. S. Gorbachev stressed, "the main causes of the present food situation in the emerging countries are related to the imperialist policy that was always intended to secure economic advantages for monopolist capital. Now this is taking the form of the neocolonial policy preventing the establishment of an independent national economy, including multisectorial agriculture, in the young states."¹¹

The transnational corporations are the most effective instrument of neocolonial policy in the food sphere. Around 100 giant TNC's actually control the sector called agribusiness, the entire sphere for the production, processing and sale of agricultural products. Under the influence of these TNC's, agriculture in the developing countries is being subordinated more and more to international monopolist capital. The TNC's are deforming the structure of agricultural production by introducing crops in demand in the world capitalist market, to the detriment of the traditional local crops constituting the diet of the laboring masses. The TNC's are also having a pernicious effect on food consumption patterns. With the aid of advertising and other means, they are creating an artificial demand for food products from the West, which are not always more inexpensive, nutritious or necessary.

The TNC's are maximizing their profits by mercilessly exploiting the manpower and natural resources of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. For example, the profit margin of such giant international monopolies as Coca-Cola, Ralston Purina and Proctor & Gamble is 25 percent in their branches in the developing countries (two or three times as high as in their domestic enterprises).¹² Workers engaged in the agricultural food sector of the economy in the developing countries are still receiving the minimum wage, however, sufficient only for physical survival.

The domination of the market by the TNC's is reducing the income of developing countries from the production of foods intended for export because the lion's share goes to the international monopolies. For example, producers of cacao in Ghana receive only 16 percent of its market cost. The countries producing bananas make even less (only 11.5 percent). This is one of the main reasons why income from exports is not enough to cover the cost of imported food products, which the developing countries have had to buy in increasing quantities. In this way, the unfair division of labor between the developed capitalist states and the developing countries in the sphere of food production and exchange is contributing directly to the exacerbation of the food problem and augmenting the scales of hunger and malnutrition.

Imperialism, especially American imperialism, speculating on human tragedy and displaying the deepest contempt for those suffering and dying from hunger, often uses deliveries of food products as political and economic leverage in its policy of coercion and blackmail. The neocolonial food strategy essentially interweaves the commercial interests of giant monopolies with the political goals of imperialism. To consolidate its dominion, imperialism uses food shipments to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and pressure countries which refuse to submit to imperialist dictates in some cases, and to support and encourage the reactionary regimes meeting its approval in other cases. The entire practice of food assistance by imperialist powers completely refutes the lies spread by the ideologists of neocolonialism about the allegedly humane and selfless nature of this assistance.

The severity of the food crisis also stems from the internal social conditions in which food is produced and consumed in the emerging countries. The multi-structured economy in the majority of these countries is being influenced more and more by the natural laws governing the development of capitalist social relations, with all of their characteristic antagonism, exacerbated during the current stage of the general crisis of capitalism.

The food crisis in the world capitalist economy, an integral part of which is the problem of hunger and malnutrition in the emerging countries, clearly reveals a characteristic tendency of capitalism--the accumulation of poverty at one pole and the commensurate accumulation of wealth at the other. This has engendered and intensified one of the most serious imbalances in the development of the food sphere in the capitalist world: On the intergovernmental level this imbalance takes the form of the growing gap between the food supplies of the small group of economically developed powers and the absolute majority of developing countries, and on the national level it takes the form of the growing gap between the food supplies of the privileged and underprivileged strata, between the satiation of one and the hunger of the other.

The land reforms conducted in the majority of emerging countries after they had won their independence stimulated the development of capitalist relations in agriculture, accompanied by the simultaneous retention of various feudal, semifeudal and other archaic forms of exploitation of the immediate producers. As a result, the land reforms did not establish the necessary conditions for the higher productivity of agricultural production and the resolution of the food problem. The intensification of property and class inequality was a social consequence of these agrarian reforms.

The situation was compounded by the rise in demand for food products under the influence of the unprecedented growth of the population and changes in its structure as a result of accelerated urbanization, industrialization, the more intense social division of labor in the agrarian sphere of the economy and the stratification of the peasantry into a rural bourgeoisie and a rural proletariat. The food imports to which developing countries had to resort to cover at least part of their food shortage did not solve the food problem but only complicated the already difficult monetary position of these countries, made them more dependent on conditions in the world market, undermined the position of local food producers and eventually exacerbated contradictions in socioeconomic and political development and intensified the impoverishment of the laboring masses.

The problem of impoverishment in the developing countries became exceptionally acute during the painful process of the rebuilding of backward traditional social structures as part of the development of capitalist relations. In the majority of these multistructured countries the capitalist relations which are established and developed are usually superimposed on obsolete feudal and semifeudal forms of exploitation, making capitalist transformation a particularly difficult and lengthy process. A precise definition of the present situation can be found in V. I. Lenin's statement that "on the border regions" of capitalism (that is, in the countries and the sectors of the national economy in which capitalism is just making its appearance and encountering pre-capitalist practices), "the growth of poverty--and not only 'social' but also the most horrible physical poverty, to the point of hunger and starvation--acquires mass dimensions."¹³

The issue of the chronic hunger and malnutrition of the poorest population strata is still on the agenda even when some developing countries reach the point of self-sufficiency in the food supply. One example is India, which was able to almost stop importing food and to even export some in recent years when weather conditions were favorable for agriculture and produced record grain harvests (151 million tons in 1984). But the achievement of self-sufficiency in grain, which has played an important role in strengthening the country's ability to resist imperialism's neocolonial pressure, took place here against the background of an extremely low national level of food production and consumption, the background of the hunger and undernourishment of 40 percent of the population.¹⁴ As one Indian researcher said in reference to this situation, "it is a combination of full grain bins and empty stomachs." Indian communists associate the severity of the food problem with the "crisis in the capitalist course of development."¹⁵

The growth of beggary and poverty in the developing world testifies that hunger and malnutrition, as social phenomena, are somewhat "autonomous" of economic growth rates if this growth is not accompanied by a group of radical social reforms, capable of securing the equitable distribution of material goods as well as the growth of agricultural production.

The natural exacerbation of food problems during the process of capitalism's development was once pointed out by F. Engels, who wrote that "mass underconsumption is an essential condition of all societal forms based on

exploitation and, consequently, of the capitalist form of society; but only the capitalist form of production can take matters to the point of crisis."¹⁶ This is corroborated by a comparison of the current situation in the Asian, African and Latin American countries with a similar situation in many European countries during the period of the initial accumulation of capital and the industrial revolution, distinguished by frequent outbreaks of mass hunger, epidemics and a high mortality rate.

The situation in the former colonies and semicolonies is complicated by the fact that capitalist relations in them are developing under the conditions of economic dependence and broader scales of imperialist neocolonial exploitation. An analysis of the main causes of the food crisis indicates that capitalism of the dependent type--the prospect afforded to emerging countries developing according to the capitalist pattern--cannot deliver the masses in these countries from unemployment, poverty, hunger and other social evils characteristic of the exploitative society, but, on the contrary, exacerbates them.

In October 1974 the delegates at a world food conference convened by the United Nations in Rome at the height of the most severe world food crisis solemnly pledged to put an end to hunger within the next decade, so that not one child would go to bed hungry and so that malnutrition would not have an adverse effect on the capabilities of any individual and would not cloud his future. Today, however, the world has a long way to go before these good intentions can be carried out. Hunger is spreading, and not diminishing. Why have the attempts to surmount this problem or at least to reduce its scales been futile?

The answer apparently lies in the fact that the people attempting to solve the food problem are deliberately or mistakenly ignoring the complex, multifaceted and essentially social nature of hunger. They are concentrating on the technological and material aspects of this acute problem. Social prerequisites aimed at creating favorable social conditions for the provision of the masses with food are being completely ignored. Experience has shown, however, that the absolute shortage of food resulting from the underdevelopment of productive forces in agriculture cannot be corrected without social reforms. The equitable distribution of food and other means of subsistence among all members of society is also impossible.

The most famous of the "technological" recipes proposed by bourgeois theorists and politicians for the resolution of the food problem in the developing countries is the so-called green revolution. This picturesque name for scientific and technical progress in agriculture became fashionable in the second half of the 1960's, when many bourgeois scholars began to associate the possibility of eradicating hunger in the emerging countries with the prospect of the dramatic augmentation of the productivity of farming with a group of agro-technical innovations and the use of better seeds, without any structural changes in existing land relationships. The group of problems connected with the "green revolution" has already been covered quite extensively in Marxist literature.¹⁷ The contradictory nature of the entire process of the capitalist modernization of agriculture under the specific conditions of developing countries warrants repetition. On the one hand, there is no question that the

"green revolution" can raise the level of agricultural production considerably. On the other, a larger output of food under the existing social conditions of the developing world certainly does not mean the increased consumption of food by poor and underprivileged population strata and cannot automatically eliminate hunger. It is highly probable that it will have negative social effects by contributing to the enrichment of the exploitative elite and the impoverishment of the rural laboring masses and by intensifying the relative agrarian overpopulation. No matter how much food is produced, millions of people living below the "poverty level" are incapable of improving their diet substantially because they do not have enough money for this. The food underproduction crisis typical of the majority of developing countries could even be replaced by a crisis of overproduction (in relation to the low purchasing power of the population) and millions of people would still be hungry.¹⁸

The futile attempts to surmount hunger and malnutrition with the aid of agrotechnological innovations reaffirm the fact that changes in the nature of agricultural production and the distribution of food products can be achieved only as a result of radical changes in the entire socioeconomic structure of the former colonies.

It would be wrong to say that bourgeois ideologists do not acknowledge the need for changes in existing social structures in the "Third World." Many of them are advocating social changes, but they consider the elimination of obsolete social structures to be necessary only to the degree and for the purpose of paving the way for capitalist relations in the economies of the developing countries and involving them more extensively in capitalist world economic ties. The experience of many emerging countries taking the capitalist road has shown, however, that the food problem is usually aggravated, and not alleviated, by the development of capitalism.

The "hunger riots" of recent years in Chile, Egypt, Tunisia and some other countries in the developing world testify that the food problem is becoming an increasingly explosive issue. The working class and other democratic forces are opposing the real culprits--the imperialist monopolies--in the class struggle for their "daily bread." The complete resolution of the food problem in the interests of the popular masses will ultimately depend on the success of this struggle and on the level of organization and awareness of these forces.¹⁹ The need to eliminate hunger and poverty is another strong argument in favor of the choice of the socialist course of development by emerging countries.

The key to the elimination of dependence and economic and cultural underdevelopment consists primarily in the gradual internal development of each country, combining economic growth with social progress. The radical socioeconomic reform of the entire social structure in the developing world is a prerequisite for real agricultural growth and the resolution of food problems. The transformation of agrarian relations in the interests of the popular masses and the transfer of land to those who work it are of primary importance. Land reforms aimed at solving the food crisis must perform a dual function--economic and social. First of all, they must promote the liberation of productive forces and the acceleration of agricultural growth rates, especially in the production of food. Secondly, they must secure the maximum use of rural

labor resources by establishing the necessary conditions for the active inclusion of the huge rural population now partially or completely unemployed in the production process and thereby increasing real consumer demand for food and other vital necessities and raising the standard of living of the laboring public.

Agrarian reforms and other socioeconomic reforms are accomplished most successfully in emerging countries choosing the socialist course of development. Of course, a socialist orientation, as the first step toward socialism, does not promise abundance in itself, particularly in economically backward countries that have not surmounted their dependence on the world capitalist economy and are still being subjected to continuous provocations and even direct aggression by imperialism, which is taking every opportunity to destabilize the situation in states with progressive governments. In spite of the obstacles erected by imperialism, the experience of the young socialist countries (Cuba, Vietnam and others) proves that only socialism is capable of quickly delivering the masses from such social ills as hunger and poverty.

The success of internal structural reforms in the developing countries depends largely on external factors and on the state of international economic and political relations. The current internationalization of the conditions engendering severe food problems in the developing countries, especially TNC expansion, presupposes the internationalization of the material prerequisites for the elimination of these problems. One of the main prerequisites for the complete resolution of the food problem is united action by the developing countries in the struggle for the reorganization of the present unfair system of international capitalist division of labor in all spheres of the economy, including agriculture. The struggle for a new world economic order, which is being waged by the emerging countries with the support of socialist countries, should secure the more equitable distribution of materials, crude resources and food in favor of the young states in Asia, Africa and Latin America and give them the right to manage their own national resources.

It should be emphasized that the complete resolution of the food problem is closely related to the struggle for peace, for international detente, for arms limitation and reduction and for disarmament. If it were possible to curb the arms race imperialism started, part of the funds now squandered on non-productive needs would be made available for the elimination of hunger and the resolution of mankind's other vitally important problems.²⁰ Specialists believe that the self-sufficiency of developing countries in food supplies would take only 0.5 percent of current world expenditures on weapons.²¹

The existence of mass hunger in the developing world is a matter of the gravest concern to the world public. "The human conscience cannot reconcile itself to the fact that tens of millions of people in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America are dying of hunger and disease and living in illiteracy and poverty."²² The need to put an end to this social calamity is dictated not only by humane feelings, but also by the increasing awareness that hunger is a serious obstacle impeding the continued development of mankind.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Universal Declaration on Human Rights," N.Y., 1948, pt 1, art 25.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 24, p 17.
3. "Assessment of the World Food Situation: Present and Future," Rome, 1974; "The State of Food and Agriculture, 1980," FAO, Rome, 1981; "Third World Affairs, 1985," London, 1985, p 69.
4. VSEMIRNOYE PROFSOYUZOYE DVIZHENIYE, 1985, No 9, p 1.
5. The mortality rate is particularly high among infants (approximately 6-10 times as high as in the economically developed countries). In some countries on the African continent it has reached catastrophic indicators-- 160-200 per 1,000 births ("UN Demographic Year Book, 1983," N.Y., 1984).
6. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 23, p 184.
7. "Critical Situation of Food and Agriculture in Africa" (UN Document, A/40/1985).
8. For a discussion of the methodological approach to the food crisis and other world problems, see V. V. Zagladin and I. T. Frolov, "Globalnyye problemy sovremennosti: nauchnyy i sotsialnyy aspekty" [Today's Global Problems: The Scientific and Social Aspects], Moscow, 1981.
9. For more detail, see L. A. Knyazhinskaya, "Rost naseleniya i prodovolstvennaya problema v razvivayushchikhsya stranakh" [Population Growth and the Food Crisis in the Developing Countries], Moscow, 1980.
10. K. Marx and F. Engels, Op. cit., vol 4, p 97.
11. M. S. Gorbachev, "CPSU Agrarian Policy During the Stage of Developed Socialism," PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, 1982, No 10, p 8.
12. H. Schilling, "Die Internationalen Monopole des Agribusiness und ihre Expansion in den Entwicklungslandern," IPW--BERICHTE, 1982, No 2, pp 17-20.
13. V. I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 4, pp 218-219.
14. The per capita grain supply in India is diminishing and amounted to only 438 kilograms in 1984, as compared to 468 kilograms in 1978 (NEW AGE, 31 March 1985; 9 June 1985).
15. PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, 1985, No 7, p 74.
16. K. Marx and F. Engels, Op. cit., vol 20, p 297.
17. See the works by L. A. Bagramov, R. P. Gurvich, V. G. Rastyannikov, A. I. Sizov, G. Ye. Skorov and other Soviet agrarian-economists.

18. A. I. Belchuk, "Ekonomicheskiye krizisy sovremennogo kapitalizma" [The Economic Crises of Present-Day Capitalism], Moscow, 1981, p 317.
19. Although poverty and hunger give rise to dissatisfaction and protest, it would be wrong to draw the simple conclusion that the class struggle grows more intense as food problems grow more acute. As V. I. Lenin pointed out, people doomed to wage an exhausting and stupefying struggle all their life for purely biological survival are thereby put "in a position which necessarily engenders submission to oppression and coercion by removing all hope of not only victory but even of struggle by the oppressed class" (V. I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 2, p 251).
20. PRAVDA, 28 January 1986.
21. R. Sivard, "World Military and Social Expenditures, 1982," Leesburg, 1982, p 31.
22. PRAVDA, 28 May 1985.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

8588

CSO: 1807/287

LIBERATION, POST-WAR 'DEMOCRATIZATION' OF EAST EUROPE NOTED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 170-178

[Article by I. S. Yazhborovskaya: "The Working Class and the Development of the Revolutions of the 1940's in the Countries of Central and Southeastern Europe"]

[Text] The defeat of Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union's decisive role in the antifascist liberation war and the Soviet people's victory had the most profound effect on world history and on the continued development of the world revolutionary process.

In the final stage of World War II, when the historic confrontation with fascism was coming to an end and the balance of power in the international arena had changed decisively, the people of central and southeastern Europe experienced a sharp turn toward democracy and socialism. As the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet People's Victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945" says, "favorable conditions were established for the struggle of the laboring masses for their social and national liberation. The position of progressive, democratic and peaceful forces was reinforced and the influence of communist and workers parties grew stronger."¹ The Soviet Army's liberating mission, the subsequent assistance the Soviet Union gave to the victims of Hitler's aggression, its support of their growing liberation struggle and its resolute repulsion of the attempts of Western powers to interfere in their internal affairs helped the liberation movement in these countries turn into popular revolutions and became "the most important condition for the development and successful completion of revolutionary reforms in them."² In the last months of the war and following its conclusion, the antifascist struggle in Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Hungary, and also--in a slightly different time span and set of specific circumstances--in East Germany, grew and developed into revolutions, which eventually led to the choice of the socialist path in these countries. These revolutions represented a new attempt to break out of the capitalist system, following the example of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The countries of central and southeastern Europe, where the decade before the war was a period of a new and dramatic exacerbation of social conflicts, were "a weak link in the world capitalist system."³ Hitler's "eastern policy"

posed a special threat to this region, which was assigned an increasingly important role in the expansionist plans of the Axis powers. Hitler's Germany based its preparations for worldwide aggression largely on the use of its resources, especially by means of exploiting the Balkan states. The process of economic and political enslavement, stimulating the internal fascistization of several states against the vital interests of their people, was accelerated. The economic depletion of these territories with the aid of the outdated social structure and the institution of a specific system of sectorial specialization and system of exchange with the increasing use of extra-economic methods of pressure, secured high profits for German monopolies and the growth of Germany's military potential. Ruling circles in this part of Europe ignored the mounting threat to their sovereignty and independence and abetted Hitlerism in its military preparations, jeopardizing the very existence of the states and people of the region.

The countries of central and southeastern Europe were among the first targets of Hitler's expansion. The ruling regimes in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia were incapable of defending their states against Hitler's aggressive encroachments, and the regime in Albania was unable to protect the state from fascist Italy. The bourgeois rulers in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Slovakia and Croatia did not defend their independence and sovereignty and became obedient vassals of Hitler's Germany, and some openly cooperated with the Hitlerites.

Czechoslovakia was the first to become part of the German military economy as a result of the Munich pact. It was the testing ground for the forced labor system the German militarists had perfected even before the beginning of World War II, with the augmentation of the Third Reich's military-industrial potential as one of its aims. Manpower from this country immediately began to be sent to German coal mines. In occupied Poland and Yugoslavia, the German monopolies quickly seized almost all industry and used it for military purposes. The state-monopolist regime, military command, occupation authorities and German concerns became the owners of enterprises. The remaining portion of medium- and small-scale industry was strictly controlled by occupation authorities and lived with the constant threat of liquidation. After hundreds of thousands of Polish prisoners of war were sent to the Reich for the harvest in October 1939, the mass deportation of workers began. The German military-industrial complex required millions of foreign workers, including workers from the enslaved countries in central and southeastern Europe, for the heaviest labor and dirtiest jobs in military production and agriculture. To establish an economic foundation for the war to rule the world and to guarantee itself superprofits, German imperialism instituted criminal forms of forced labor, particularly for the utilization of stolen raw materials and equipment. This was accomplished through overt brutality, using fascist means and methods. The foreign workers living in barracks behind barbed wire had no rights and were cheap objects of the most shameless exploitation, oppression and offenses to human dignity. At the Krupp enterprises, for example, a worker could be arrested and sent to a penal colony, corrective labor camp or concentration camp for the slightest infraction.

The Hitlerite occupation, the policy of robbing the enslaved countries, the national oppression of people to the point of their extermination, the

complete devastation of the economic structure, the destruction of production capacities and the overall disorganization of civilian production were accompanied by merciless exploitation, the increase of the work day to 12-15 hours, the steady decline of real wages and the creation of a complex and humiliating repressive system. So-called "modern methods of management" were introduced everywhere--coercive measures to discourage violations of labor contracts, a longer work day, transfers to other jobs, the prohibition of resignations from jobs if this should "injure German interests" and so forth. The social gains of the laboring public were eliminated and the proletariat was doomed to poverty, unemployment and hunger.

The extreme forms of exploitation and national oppression, the constant terror and the special forms of discrimination against "Eastern" workers led to the quick and sharp exacerbation of conflicts between German imperialism and fascism on one side and the enslaved people of central and south-eastern Europe on the other. This strengthened their resistance and stimulated a more active liberation struggle.

When the Hitlerites took command of the economies in the satellite countries of Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary, they acted through their reactionary governments. Here they conducted their policy of robbery and devastation with less overt methods and shared some of the spoils with local collaborators. The practice of sending all of the food and natural resources out of these countries and the considerable expansion of the position of German monopolies in their economies, which were placed at the service of militarism and fascism, soon produced results. The occupation of Hungary and the arrival of German troops in March 1944 proved that the slightly more liberal tactics employed in the treatment of this "ally" concealed the same goal--unlimited exploitation in the interests of German imperialism and the disorganization and subversion of the satellite countries' economies.⁴

Nazi policy inflicted colossal injuries on the working class in the region. Whereas there were slightly more than 10 million workers in industry just before the war, by the end of the war the figure had been reduced by half, despite the slight rise in employment in sectors operating for fascist Germany.⁵ The proletariat in large-scale industry suffered the most: Its most active members were in jails and concentration camps or in penal companies on the front. The working class was scattered and had no opportunity for the organized defense of its rights. In spite of this, it took a firm stand in the forward ranks of the antifascist liberation struggle. Its primary objectives were liberation from the fascist yoke, the restoration of national independence and sovereignty and struggle for the democratization of public life.⁶ Called upon by virtue of its very nature to play a leading role in the liberation struggle, it displayed the qualities of the main revolutionary force of our era and served all antifascists as an example of militant spirit and active armed resistance. The vanguard of the working class was mature and strong enough to become the organizer of the antifascist struggle, secure the rapid development of a mass national liberation movement and head the struggle to solve national problems.

The antifascist liberation struggle was begun by communist and workers parties long before 1 September 1939. They were the first to point out the dangers of

Hitler's fascism, of the political and economic enslavement of their countries by fascist states and of the exceptionally menacing aggressive plans to start a new war against the USSR and central and southeastern Europe. The communists took the most consistent patriotic position and asked all nations to unite their forces against the Hitlerist threat. During the war years they were the most resolute fighters against the fascist yoke and for the liberation of their countries, the restoration of national independence and sovereignty, the eradication of fascism and the institution of sweeping democratic reforms.

Many members of the bourgeoisie and the wealthier urban and rural petty bourgeois strata in the satellite countries supported the regimes which were rapidly becoming fascist, and the property-owning classes affiliated with the Hitlerites became more reactionary. The members of these strata who took a neutral position later supported the antifascist movement as it developed. The antifascist movement in the occupied countries was joined by petty bourgeois strata and also by some members of the bourgeoisie in several cases, especially in Czechoslovakia. The defeats suffered by the Hitlerist bloc's armies promoted the growth of antiwar and anti-imperialist movements, establishing new and more favorable conditions for the struggle for democracy. The antifascist members of the bourgeoisie, however, usually supported the governments in exile and waited passively for help from the Anglo-American bloc. Their contradictory attitudes toward the resistance movement, their refusal to attain national liberation objectives by means of popular antifascist struggle, and their anti-Sovietism were inconsistent with the logic of the national liberation struggle and the goal of defeating fascism as an extreme form of imperialist reaction. This was one of the main reasons for the substantial change in the balance of class and political power, which became particularly apparent at the time of the most dramatic turning point in the war. The working class and its parties chose the course of broad-scale armed antifascist struggle in the public interest. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, which held out the real possibility of victory over fascism, gave this struggle strong momentum.

The communist and workers parties in central and southeastern Europe, which were operating underground and had suffered colossal injuries, were able to lead the masses in the historic feats of national liberation and the defeat of fascism because they were able to work out a policy line corresponding to the new conditions and based on Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of antifascist struggle. They took the leading position in the liberation struggle and proposed a nationwide program for the liberation and recovery of their countries on the basis of revolutionary-democratic reforms. Their policy, which combined accurately defined goals and aims with reliance on the constructive capabilities of a strong mass democratic movement for reform, clearly reflected the basic tendencies in historical development and was based on the idea of a fighting alliance with the USSR and other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition and on the establishment of military interaction with the Red Army. They were firmly convinced that only joint struggle could liberate the people of central and southeastern Europe from the fascist yoke. And it was precisely because the course of the war invariably proved the accuracy of their line and its correspondence to the interests of the quickest possible liberation of people that the influence of communists among the masses

grew stronger with each day. They won prestige and recognition and the trust and support of much of the laboring public by directing combat operations, leading the masses and instilling them with the spirit of genuine patriotism. Mobilizing the antifascist patriotic forces for an uncompromising fight against Hitler's fascism, the communists prepared to start a general armed uprising and liberation war as the military pressure on Hitler's Germany increased and favorable conditions were established.

The communists relied on the working class, which spontaneously began the struggle on the first days of the occupation, choosing sabotage as their weapon--the reduction of labor productivity, the breakdown of equipment, the destruction of raw materials and the spoilage of products. The transition to active forms of resistance was accompanied by increased subversive activity. Workers formed self-defense, resistance and action groups. The working class was the first to start the armed struggle and constituted the basis of partisan detachments. After their shift in plants and mines, workers often conducted combat operations--destroying combat equipment, killing enemy soldiers and derailing troop trains heading east.

The enslaved peoples steadily grew more resolute in their participation in the liberation struggle. The broad masses became more active because the war against fascism was a just war and was directed against the bulwark of imperialist reaction. Democratic forces gathered, united and rallied round the communists' proposed line of armed struggle against the occupation forces. National fronts, with communist and workers parties playing the leading role in them, acquired a political structure.

Fighters from the military units and partisan armies and detachments of Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, patriots in Bulgaria, Romania, Albania and Hungary, members of the resistance movement and the antifascist underground fought selflessly against the fascist invaders.

The Yugoslavian people's liberation war acquired broad dimensions. Taking the lead in the armed struggle against occupation forces and their stooges in July 1941, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) formed a mass united national liberation front, within which the laboring public rallied round the communists. By 1941, national liberation committees had been set up in liberated territories, serving simultaneously as organs of struggle and organs of power, and their actions against the invaders and collaborators were objectively directed against the bourgeoisie.⁷ A central organ, the National Committee for the Liberation of Yugoslavia, was created by a decision of the second session of the Antifascist National Liberation Assembly of Yugoslavia (29-30 November 1943) as the embryo of a future democratic regime.

In Poland the Polish Workers Party (PPR), founded in January 1942, united the forces of laborers for a struggle for national freedom and independence under the slogan of a democratic national front. It was unable to unite all forces in the resistance movement as a result of the tactics of the majority of underground groups, which were motivated by anticommunism and anti-Sovietism to start a civil war with the aim of stifling leftist activity. The National Guard and People's Army established by the PPR attracted all patriots willing

to join the active armed struggle against the Hitlerites. The People's Border Guard formed at the suggestion of communists during the night of 1 January 1944 and the local forces formed later became organs of the national front and the foundation of a future democratic regime.

In December 1943 the Czechs and Slovaks agreed to cooperate in the creation of a national front, in which the antifascist wing of the bourgeoisie would participate but the main role would be played by the working class. National committees established throughout the country became organs of the front. After March 1945 the working class was the recognized leader of the struggle for national freedom and independence.

Two currents took shape in the resistance movement in Albania in fall 1942: National liberation councils were formed as part of the national liberation front under communist leadership, while the pro-Western "national front" formed by the wealthier classes actually cooperated with occupation forces. The danger of civil war increased.

In the satellite countries the political program of communists emphasized the unification of patriotic, antifascist, democratic forces and a break with Hitler's Germany with the aim of the complete eradication of fascism and the consistent democratization of public life. In Bulgaria the working class united forces and strengthened its alliance with the peasantry and the urban middle strata on the basis of the Fatherland Front Program (July 1942), envisaging the liberation of the country from domination by foreign capital and the free and independent development of Bulgaria. Local committees were formed, and in August 1943 a national fatherland front committee was formed with communists playing the leading role. A national liberation rebel army was formed.

A patriotic anti-Hitler front made its appearance in Romania in summer 1943, followed by the creation of an antifascist coalition which included bourgeois parties after the communists and social democrats had agreed to cooperate. The United Labor Front, formed from below, played a special role. Its committees were formed at enterprises and its program was published on 1 May 1944, envisaging not only an antifascist liberation struggle, but also the resolution of social problems and the management of national affairs by the public. The program stressed that the working class would lead this struggle. This stimulated the creation of partisan detachments.

The Hungarian National Front for Independence made its appearance during the struggle for national liberation after the reorganization and expansion of the Hungarian front that had existed since May 1944. The occupation of Hungary by the Wehrmacht and the brutal repression prevented the accelerated development of the armed struggle in the country. Even here, however, an antifascist partisan movement was formed. Communists proposed a program for the democratic revival and recovery of Hungary (November 1944), envisaging not only a break with Hitler's Germany but also the eradication of the roots of fascism in the country, the institution of antimonopolist, democratic measures and the creation of national committees and a provisional government. This program became the basis of the activity of democratic national committees and the provisional national government in the liberated zone.

When the Soviet Army was approaching, the people of central and southeastern Europe were inspired by the immediacy of liberation and rose up in an open armed struggle. The successful Iasi-Kishinev operation of the Soviet troops contributed to the triumphant antifascist rebellion in Bucharest on 23 August 1944 and the overthrow of General Antonescu's fascist dictatorship. A Slovakian national uprising began on 29 August. The popular antifascist armed rebellion in Bulgaria was victorious on 9 September. The Bulgarian and Romanian armies joined the fight against the German troops.

Attitudes toward fascist Germany and the choice of methods of struggle against Hitlerism became criteria of the correspondence of the policy of various parties in central and southeastern Europe to the genuine interests of the people. Only a resolute struggle against the fascists and their hangers-on and a willingness to completely eradicate fascism, eliminate the after-effects of the war at speeds and with methods meeting the interests of the laboring public, frustrate the selfish aims of monopolies and accomplish the consistent democratization of public life could expect the support of the broad masses in these countries. Only the quick and total defeat of fascism and other forms of imperialist reaction was in their national interests, and it would signify more thorough democratization, the expansion of the front of forces fighting for it and a step toward the radical transformation of social relations. As the liberation struggle grew more active and persistent, the masses became more closely involved in it, organized more massive demonstrations and made more demands engendered by the class struggle. The working class and its vanguard, the communist and workers parties, combined the struggles for national and social liberation most completely and organically. As the editors of *PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA* noted in a discussion of the revolutions of the 1940's in the countries of central and southeastern Europe, "the communists performed a historic service by giving the desires and interests of the working class and the laboring masses tangible political form, proved the possibility of their realization, organized the social forces needed for this and headed the great process of social and political reform."⁸ The revolutions of the 1940's grew out of the mass antifascist, national liberation struggle, which was directed against foreign conquerors and, to an increasing extent, against internal reactionary forces. In this way they acquired profound social meaning.

The struggle of people in the occupied countries, the struggle of the masses in the satellite countries, against Hitler's fascism and their own reactionary regimes led to a sharp reversal in foreign policy aims, excluding the possibility of a repetition of imperialist aggression, and signaled the choice of a policy of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance with the USSR. The liberated countries made use of the favorable conditions, created by the radical change in the world balance of power at the time of the final defeat of Hitler's fascism, for democratic development. The international situation of that time, reinforced by Soviet diplomatic efforts, and the immediate possibility of relying on the USSR's economic and political assistance and on its military strength allowed them to escape the export of imperialist counter-revolution. Due to the prevalence of general objectives--the eradication of fascism and the institution of democratic reforms--this democratic reorganization followed its own pattern in each country, in accordance with the specific conditions (the state of the economy, the alignment of sociopolitical forces,

the level of maturity of the working class, the level of mass organization, historical traditions, etc.) determining the forms, methods and speed of the development of the revolutionary process.

The more intense antifascist, democratic reorganization of society in the interests of the laboring public with its active participation in this process, which dialectically coordinated questions of national and social development, led inevitably to qualitative socioeconomic and political changes. There was an increasing awareness of the historical necessity of these changes.

The working class, which had played the decisive role in the armed struggle against the Hitlerites, had defended homes and plants against destruction during the period of the fascist retreat and had established itself as the leader of the antifascist, democratic, antimonopolist struggle, took important positions in the organs of the new, popular-democratic regime (particularly on the local level) and in various links of the governmental structure. After the fascists had been driven away, it continued to extend its leadership to all fields of revolutionary activity--political, military, economic, organizational, propagandistic, etc. In countries where political differences were most pronounced, large segments of the dominant classes opposed the resistance forces (Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania) and communist parties had the greatest influence among the masses. Wherever the bourgeoisie participated in the resistance movement and competed for leadership in it (Czechoslovakia and Poland), a more lengthy struggle had to be waged for the masses. Wherever the antifascist liberation movement was weaker (Romania and Hungary), the communists were a minority and strengthened their position during the later development of the revolution.⁹

Throughout the region the development of the revolutionary process depended on the actual status of the working class, on the level of its maturity and on its awareness of its duties and its historic mission. In the majority of countries it suffered heavy losses in the war years, was largely isolated from large-scale production and was frequently scattered and disorganized. It acquired a largely new composition, and its individual groups and strata had already been distinguished by differing degrees of class awareness in the past. The war compounded certain negative developments, the consequences of the destruction of socioeconomic structures were revealed, and part of the proletariat was declassed. Its class consciousness was severely damaged. Some of its detachments and members in several countries were influenced by bourgeois ideology and by the need to solve nationwide problems and did not immediately realize their special class interests, interests not coinciding with those of the bourgeoisie.

At the same time, the war taught workers a great deal and drew various strata of the working class into the struggle for democracy and socialism. The liberation movement and the efforts to eradicate fascism and begin the democratization of society were strong stimuli for the revival, organization and political development of this class. Making use of the experience accumulated by communist parties in lengthy class battles, it underwent, in K. Marx' words, "an entire series of historical processes," changing both circumstances

and people, and learned lessons from the historical process "not only for the purpose of changing existing conditions, but also for the purpose of changing itself and making itself capable of political leadership."¹⁰ In Marx' definition, "revolution is necessary not only because the dominant class cannot be overthrown by any other means, but also because the overthrowing class can only get rid of all its loathsome features and become capable of establishing a new social foundation in a revolution."¹¹ The working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe traveled a long road within a few years of revolution, giving it the ability to fight for the ideals of socialism and surmount "conflicts in the development of its consciousness and temporary forms of political behavior in certain countries and during certain periods, behavior inconsistent with the role assigned to it by its status in the system of social production."¹²

The principal method of mobilizing the forces of the working class was the revival of a class labor movement on a unified basis. During the war years the progressive trade unions were dispersed and disbanded by the fascists. Many union activists died and others had to operate illegally. The working class was in such a difficult position that the unification of its efforts was essential. The proletariat looked for help and salvation in associations which were often united by professional characteristics around resistance cells and rallied round labor organizations which had been revived underground. A qualitatively new process was already apparent in the occupied countries at the beginning of the 1940's: The labor movement, which had been divided into dozens or hundreds of organizations by national and religious differences and by political affiliations before the war, surmounted all previous boundaries. The process of revival from below, which could only be directed by the revolutionary vanguard of the working class--the communist parties, mobilizing forces for the resolution of urgent national and social problems--appealed to various strata of the working class with a common interest in defending their vital interests. When G. Dimitrov addressed the Seventh Comintern Congress and said that the fragmentation and disunity of the labor movement, maintained by the bourgeoisie, would have to be surmounted, as would the schismatic tactics and policy of class cooperation of reformist leaders, reflected most clearly in trade unions, he pointed out the need for an unremitting struggle against the offensive attacks of capitalism and fascism and for guaranteed democracy in trade unions.¹³ He said that the offensive launched by reactionary and fascist forces had motivated workers, despite the passive position of reformist leaders in the countries of central and southeastern Europe, to rally round trade unions more closely, and he noted a tendency toward the quantitative growth of the unions. The unity of trade unions in the countries of this region was considered to be almost unattainable due to the deep rift in the labor movement and the anticommunism of social-democratic leaders. In this part of Europe, however, it was not only necessary, but often the only realistic way of establishing a united working class front. G. Dimitrov underscored the special importance of organizing the working class through trade unions, through "a network of nonpartisan class organs of the front at enterprises, among the unemployed and in worker neighborhoods."¹⁴

On the eve of World War II the trade unions were an arena of intense internal struggle for the maintenance of class positions and for worker unity. The

fascistized regimes tried to unify trade unions from above by following the example of Italian corporations and making it compulsory for all workers to join state labor organizations.

At the time of the liberation movement's growth, and especially after liberation, the idea of forming new and free democratic trade unions evoked a tremendous response. Continuing the line of struggle worked out by the Seventh Comintern Congress for trade-union solidarity, the communist and workers parties revived unions on a single class basis as a major bulwark of anti-fascist struggle, as the basis of the nonpartisan organization of workers and as an important means of securing and expanding the hegemony of the working class. The particularly rapid growth of the unions and their unification took place during the period of liberation, when the working class threw off the hated yoke of fascism. The establishment of unions was accompanied by mass demonstrations, rallies and meetings. The organizational congresses of the unified trade unions were celebrated as great holidays. The working class created unified national labor centers in all countries of central and south-eastern Europe in 1944 and 1945. The increased activity of all segments of the working class promoted their rapid democratization. The thirst for unity of the working class, which now had a sense of its strength, was so great that the attempts made by bourgeois and petty bourgeois forces to take command of part of the proletariat and their efforts to create separate solidarist and reformist unions were complete failures. The organization of unified trade unions promoted interaction by communists with all or some socialists.

As the leading factor in the consolidation of the working class, the trade unions had already united the majority of laborers by 1945-1946. The trade unions organized close interaction with other mass social organizations created on the initiative of communists--youth groups, women's organizations and others--and helped them solve organizational problems, uniting efforts in the establishment of a new life, the restoration of the ravaged economy, the organization of public education, etc. In Czechoslovakia, for example, youth commissions of the revolutionary union movement were formed at plants. In Poland youth job placement services were performed by the national "Services for Poland" organization, which secured jobs and occupations for tens of thousands of young people and provided the economy, which was rising out of the ruins of the country, with manpower.

The trade unions became the immediate base of communist support and simultaneously became an important link in the sociopolitical system and an important element of national fronts, aiding in the maintenance and reinforcement of broad political alliances and the use of bourgeois-democratic traditions and institutions for the accomplishment of profound revolutionary-democratic reforms and the attraction of hesitant population strata to the side of the working class.

Whereas the working class and its parties still represented a revolutionary minority during the period when popular governments were being established in the majority of countries, during the course of the peaceful development of the revolutionary process, which facilitated the struggle for the masses immeasurably and made it more productive, they constantly grew and acquired

stronger political positions, appealing to the politically awakened laboring public. On the strength of the change in the world balance of power in socialism's favor, a change brought about by the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War, contributing to what V. I. Lenin termed the "extremely rare" peaceful development of revolutions,¹⁵ the communist parties found the means and methods of gradually strengthening the political position of the working class by introducing what Lenin referred to as "unique features into various forms of democracy and different varieties of dictatorship by the proletariat."¹⁶ The consistent peaceful development of the revolutionary process was predetermined by the establishment, maintenance and reinforcement of working class hegemony. The logic of this development, the intensification of the revolutionary process and the overt or covert transition from the attainment of democratic objectives to the attainment of purely socialist ones, in accordance with Lenin's methodology, required "rising levels of training for the proletariat," its organization, precise political positions and the ability to unite allies and convince the bourgeoisie of the futility of resistance by isolating it from the masses.¹⁷ The working class was the only class capable of heading the general democratic struggle of the masses, which aided in the convergence of objectively timely democratic and socialist aims and the comparatively rapid accomplishment of revolutionary-democratic reforms.

A decisive role in the development and improvement of the political system in the interests of the working class was played by the national fronts created on the initiative of communists--the national liberation front in Yugoslavia, the national front of Czechs and Slovaks, the fatherland front in Bulgaria, the Hungarian front for national independence, the national front of the Romanian people and others. The working class and its representatives used these fronts for struggle and for the exercise of power. High-level representative front organs were established as supreme organs of power, and the national fronts gave rise to governments with legislative functions and, to one degree or another, to local organs of power or controlled them. Later all of these structures played an important role in the formation of a new governmental structure.

The national front in Poland was relatively less institutionalized than in other countries. Here it was not united by a social organization, but by a mass politico-ideological movement. With the exception of the popular assembly and government, where four parties worked together, only coordinating commissions operated on the local and central levels. In the 1947 elections the front took the form of a democratic campaign bloc with a general election platform and a single list of deputatorial candidates.

Whereas the unified system of government on the local level in Yugoslavia and Albania was formed during the period of the liberation struggle, in other countries the structure and form of organs of power underwent changes, by different methods and at differing speeds, during the peaceful development of the revolutionary process. Earlier organs of local administration resumed their activities and worked with national front councils and committees (in Bulgaria and Hungary); in Poland and Czechoslovakia the latter were empowered to oversee all government activity; in Czechoslovakia the national committees quickly replaced the bourgeois administration.¹⁸ While retaining traditional

forms, the popular government also gave them new meaning during the peaceful development of the class struggle.

The legal political struggle under the conditions of broad popular democracy gave the masses a chance to learn through personal experience that the program of the working class and its parties was wholly in the public interest and that it expressed the interests of the masses most consistently. On this basis, the working class strengthened and expanded its guiding and directing role. Within the framework of the national fronts, the masses accumulated the necessary political experience and the working class strengthened its alliance with the laboring peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia and accomplished major political and economic tasks for the development of the revolution. Fighting to make the national front a bloc of the broadest forces, united around the working class, and not merely a coalition of a few political parties, the communist parties endeavored to secure the attainment of the goals of national fronts and the programs of their governments not only by coordinating the actions of political parties, but also and primarily by emphasizing the development of a broad mass movement and mobilizing the masses for the implementation of measures planned by the working class and meeting the needs of all laborers. This was accompanied by the coordination of political party platforms, a process facilitated by the formulation of the precise position of the broad masses, in all matters pertaining to democratic reforms, the elimination of friction and competition between parties representing public interests and the simultaneous frustration of the attempts of some of their leaders to revise their policies and form alliances with class opponents.

As soon as the first stage of the establishment of the political system was completed, the further development of the revolution, as stipulated in communist and workers party programs, became an urgent necessity in several countries in spring, summer and fall 1945. Communists countered the efforts of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie to restore the pre-war order with efforts to strengthen the regime, consolidate the popular-democratic order and augment the social content of reforms. A struggle broke out over methods of stabilizing and restoring the economy (rightwing forces traditionally relied on the "assistance" of Western capital) and the scope and nature of agrarian reform and the nationalization of industry and banks.

Socioeconomic reforms in the economy began during the period of liberation, when the working class started forming plant committees, factory and plant councils and various trade-union organs to guard enterprises against pillage and destruction. The establishment of worker control played a tremendous role in the restoration and start-up of enterprises. At enterprises confiscated from German capitalists and collaborators, worker control agencies took an active part in the organization and management of production, aiding in the restoration of industry, the mobilization of its resources for the quickest possible establishment of a normal peaceful life and the immediate completion of Hitlerism's defeat. After being legislatively secured by organs of people's power in 1945, worker control restricted the actions of capitalists even more, broadened participation by the working class in the organization of production and the determination of the guidelines and speed of enterprise operations, and aided in the defense of the economic, social

and cultural interests of labor. The determination of production expenditures, the prices of goods, the use of raw materials and the observance of worker and state interests led to fierce arguments at private enterprises. Worker control heightened the production and political activity of the laboring public, its responsibility for the state of the economy and its realization of its role in the construction of a new society. It established conditions for the collectivization of production and for an economic victory over the bourgeoisie.¹⁹

When the communists organized the working class and raised its class consciousness, they performed a tremendous amount of ideological work in trade unions, social organizations, youth groups and other worker organizations. Their most important job was to surmount the anarchist-syndicalist, social-democratic theories of "trade-union neutrality," to popularize the idea of combining the defense of the economic interests of the laboring public with the defense of its political interests and to strengthen the political position of the working class and the entire democratic camp. Trade unions became more actively involved in revolutionary-democratic reforms, especially socioeconomic ones, and expanded their protective and social activities. The increased activity of trade unions stepped up the development of the revolutionary process and simultaneously brought about qualitative changes in the labor movement itself, filling it with new meaning and bringing it closer to the attainment of objectives characteristic of trade unions in the socialist society.

The unified revolutionary trade unions in Czechoslovakia announced the restriction of private ownership and the need to fight for socialism from the very beginning. Launching a struggle for the nationalization of industry in the middle of 1945, the working class resolutely opposed bourgeois resistance. Delegations from enterprises and entire branches of industry demanded nationalization and the expansion of its boundaries from the government Presidium and the Ministry of Industry, backed up by the Central Trade Union Council. A decree drafted by the Communist Party on the scales, forms and sequence of nationalization was approved by the Central Trade Union Council and supported by the Social Democrats. Under pressure from the working class, President Benes signed decrees on nationalization on 24 October 1945.²⁰ The activities of trade unions were particularly important in politics in Slovakia, where they were the stronghold of people's power at the time when the rightwing Democratic Party had launched a massive campaign to discourage laborers from joining trade unions.

In Poland the working class and the congress of trade unions played the decisive role in stopping the reprivatization of industry (temporarily under government control) and in the political preparations, supervised by the PPR, for the enactment of the law on the nationalization of industry on 3 January 1946. In Romania, where the revolutionary process was developing at a slightly different speed and where the Satenescu government was creating economic difficulties, the trade unions took measures to counteract this policy, promoted an increase in production output and drove saboteurs out of enterprise administrations. Workers control organs were supported by armed detachments of workers.

In Bulgaria the workers in trade unions were extremely active politically. Trade unions mobilized labor for the restoration of industry and the augmentation of labor productivity under the slogan of stronger people's power and a larger contribution to the victory over fascism. Struggle for an increase in output, the unions took measures to restrict the economic power of the bourgeoisie. Even before private ownership of the means of production had been eradicated, the working class had joined the shock labor movement as a result of the indoctrinational work performed by trade unions. Entire collectives and cities participated in competition and negotiated contracts. In summer 1945 the first youth production brigades made their appearance and the multi-machine movement was launched in the textile industry.

On the recommendations of trade unions, hundreds of workers and specialists committed to popular government were sent to state establishments when the government was being purged of fascist elements.²¹

Under the conditions of the peaceful development of the revolution, the attainment of revolutionary-democratic and class-proletarian objectives was interwoven. At differing speeds and with the aid of different methods, the working class broadened the social base of the socialist revolution and drew new strata into the struggle for socialism. In some countries (Bulgaria and Yugoslavia) the working class immediately won the leading position in society, and in others its struggle grew more decisive and consistent as the revolution developed, and its hegemony grew increasingly all-encompassing; it sought and secured the approach and transition to socialist revolution and solved problems connected with hegemony and dictatorship in the socialist coup itself.

During the development of the revolutionary process the main front of class struggle separated the working class and the laboring masses from reactionary forces. Rightwing political parties endeavoring to eliminate popular government had no chance to operate legally in most cases and had to go underground.

The attempts of reactionary forces to retain a mass base were doomed at the moment the agrarian reform began: The landowner class lost its influence and could no longer expect the support of the peasantry. Even though the peasants had not completely taken the side of the working class, vacillating strata had already been largely neutralized. The working class won the allegiance of its main ally by resolutely supporting its demand for the distribution of land and rendering real assistance in the institution of agrarian reform through the efforts of trade unions, worker brigades, etc. They participated in the confiscation of the property of landowners, formed farm labor committees, helped them take property inventories and divide the land and supervised the correct institution of the reform. The cultural-labor brigades were an important element in the reinforcement of the worker-peasant alliance in Bulgaria. They helped to repair agricultural equipment and organize public health and cultural services. The worker and peasant alliance grew stronger and the class basis of the revolutionary regime grew broader.

The working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe was not only the main generator of the national liberation movement, but also the leader of the antifascist, democratic, antimonopolist struggle, the struggle

for socialism. With the aid of its experienced Marxist-Leninist parties, it constantly gained stronger political influence among the masses and repeatedly confirmed, strengthened and expanded its hegemony. The rapid growth of the membership and prestige of communist and workers parties and the speed of their recovery from the colossal damages they had suffered during the war years were indicators of the popularity of their policies. After resolving to create a mass party, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which had only 75,000 members just before the war started, had 597,000 on Czech lands alone by July 1945, 713,000 by the end of September and 1.081 million by the end of March 1946.²² The membership of the PPR increased 11.7-fold and that of the Romanian Communist Party increased 12.8-fold between the beginning of the liberation period and the end of 1945. The Hungarian Communist Party had 12 times as many members in August 1945 as in December 1944, and its membership then increased 5.5-fold between May 1945 and the end of 1947. The CPY membership increased 12-fold and the membership of the Bulgarian Communist Party increased 20-fold by June 1947.²³

These figures provide conclusive proof of the rapid political maturation and constantly growing organization of the working class. The programs proposed by the working class vanguard for economic recovery, socioeconomic development, the further improvement of the political system and the attainment of the goals of class struggle were widely supported by the most diverse strata of this class and by the peasantry and progressive intelligentsia. The higher prestige of communist and workers parties and the desire to work with them, with the working class, under their political guidance, in the revolutionary transformation of society and in the struggle for worker interests were reflected everywhere in mass demonstrations by communists and, to a slightly lesser degree, by the members of social-democratic parties.

The reinforcement of the leading role of the working class secured the intensification of the revolution and the establishment and reinforcement of proletarian dictatorship. The natural tendencies of the socialist revolution became increasingly apparent as the revolutionary process developed.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 17 June 1984.
2. "SSSR i strany narodnoy demokratii. Stanovleniye otnosheniy druzhby i sotrudnichestvo. 1944-1949 gg." [The USSR and the Countries of Popular Democracy. The Establishment of Relations of Friendship and Cooperation. 1944-1949], Moscow, 1985, p 4.
3. "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii" [International Workers Movement. Questions of History and Theory], vol 5, "The Builder of Socialism. The Fighter Against Fascism," Moscow, 1981, p 329.
4. "Velikiy Oktyabr i revolyutsii 40-kh godov v stranakh Tsentralnoy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy. Opyt sravnitel'nogo izucheniya sotsialno-ekonomicheskikh preobrazovaniy v revolyutsionnom protsesse"

[Great October and the Revolutions of the 1940's in the Countries of Central and Southeastern Europe. An Experimental Comparative Study of Socioeconomic Reforms in the Revolutionary Process], Moscow, 1982, pp 94-100.

5. A. I. Fushkash, "The Development of the Working Class of the Socialist Countries of Europe," in the book "Iz istorii sotsialisticheskogo stroitelstva v stranakh Tsentralnoy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy" [From the History of Socialist Construction in the Countries of Central and Southeastern Europe], Moscow, 1979, pp 108-110.
6. A. I. Sobolev, "The Dialectics of General and Particular Factors in the World Revolutionary Process," VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, 1975, No 11, p 29.
7. "Velikiy Oktyabr...", p 108.
8. "The Social Revolutions of the 1940's," PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, 1984, No 7, p 45.
9. Ya. B. Shmeral, "Some Common Features of the Popular-Democratic and Socialist Revolutions in the Countries of Central and Southeastern Europe," in the book "Iz istorii narodno-demokraticheskikh i sotsialisticheskikh revolyutsiy v stranakh Tsentralnoy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy" [From the History of the Popular-Democratic and Socialist Revolutions in the Countries of Central and Southeastern Europe], Moscow, 1977, p 32.
10. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 8, p 431; vol 17, p 347.
11. Ibid., vol 3, pp 70, 201.
12. Yu. A. Krasin, "Teoriya sotsialisticheskoy revolyutsii: leninskoye nasledie i sovremennost" [The Theory of Socialist Revolution: The Leninist Heritage and the Present Day], Moscow, 1977, p 67.
13. "VII kongress Kominterna i borba protiv fashizma i voyny (Sbornik dokumentov)" [Seventh Comintern Congress and the Struggle Against Fascism and War (Collected Documents)], Moscow, 1975, pp 162, 165.
14. Ibid., p 175.
15. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 122; vol 34, pp 222-223; vol 36, pp 531-532.
16. Ibid., vol 30, p 123.
17. Ibid., vol 11, pp 90, 222; vol 30, p 122; vol 37, p 312.
18. For more detail, see L. S. Yagodovskiy, "Narodnyy front v yevropeyskikh stranakh sotsializma" [The Popular Front in the European Socialist Countries], Moscow, 1968, pp 38-47.

19. For more detail, see V. A. Vinogradov, "Rabochiy kontrol nad proizvodstvom. Teoriya. Istoriya. Sovremennost" [Worker Control of Production. Theory, History and the Present Day], Moscow, 1983, pp 222-247.
20. For more detail, see G. P. Murashko, "Borba rabocheho klassa za natsionalizatsiyu promyshlennosti. Iz opyta revolyutsiy 40-kh godov v stranakh Tsentralnoy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy" [The Struggle of the Working Class for the Nationalization of Industry. From the Experience of the Revolutions of the 1940's in the Countries of Central and South-eastern Europe], Moscow, 1979.
21. S. Genov and K. Andreyev, "Profsoyuzy Bolgarii na sovremennom etape" [Bulgarian Trade Unions in Contemporary History], Moscow, 1976, p 45.
22. Ya. B. Shmeral, "The Alignment of Political Forces in Czechoslovakia After the Liberation of the Country and the Strategic Line of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia," in the book "Iz istorii narodno-demokraticheskikh...", pp 278-279.
23. PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, 1984, No 7, p 45; "Partie komunistyczne i robotnicze swiata," Warsaw, 1978, pp 111, 121; "Zjednoczenie ruchu robotniczego w socjalistycznych krajach Europy," Warsaw, 1978, p 295.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

8588

CSO: 1807/287

THREE BOOKS ON IRAN'S HISTORY, REVOLUTION, REGIME REVIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNIY MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 182-185

[Review by N. A. Kuznetsova of books "Iran v proshlom i nastoyashchem. Puti i formy revolyutsionnogo protsessa" [Iran in the Past and Present. Patterns and Forms of the Revolutionary Process] by S. L. Agayev, Moscow, Nauka, 1981, 271 pages; "Iranskaya revolyutsiya, SShA i mezhdunarodnaya bezopasnost. 444 dnya v zalozhnikakh" [The Iranian Revolution, the United States and International Security. 444 Days in Captivity] by S. L. Agayev, Moscow, Nauka, 1984, 278 pages; "Iran: rozhdeniye respublik" [Iran: Birth of the Republic] by S. L. Agayev, Moscow, Politizdat, 1984, 336 pages]

[Text] The Iranian revolution of 1978 and 1979, which the Iranian ruling clergy has termed nothing other than an "Islamic" revolution, is still, 7 years after its triumph, the object of unabating interest in the world, intensified by an entire series of related and serious problems. The tension in the Persian Gulf zone, escalated by the war between Iran and Iraq that is already in its sixth year and could have unpredictable consequences; the doctrine of the "export of Islamic revolution," announced by the leaders of the Shiite clergy and evoking a morbid reaction in other Muslim countries; the mass repression, persecution and execution of the opponents of the Islamic regime in Iran itself from among the representatives of leftist democratic and liberal-bourgeois forces, the supporters of the overthrown shah's regime and, finally, members of the Shiite clergy who disagree with the clerical dictatorship in the country--all of this makes Iran a matter of constant public interest.

Articles in the press have not always given the general reading public a sufficiently clear and concise description of the revolutionary events, the reversals of the stormy political upheavals, the complex activities of various parties and groups and the exact tactics of the leaders of the clergy that allowed them to give the anti-shah movement an Islamic nature at a specific stage of the movement and later seize power. In fact, was it an easy matter to determine the true intentions of the Islamic leaders or understand the domestic political situation in post-revolutionary Iran while all of this was still going on? And without this, it is understandably quite difficult to assess the significance and discern the connection and very logic of such acts as the seizure and subsequent 14-month retention of the U.S. embassy in Tehran,

the periodic anti-Soviet propaganda campaigns, the provocation of the war with Iraq, the assistance of Afghan counterrevolutionaries, the behavior of the Iranian "guardians of the Islamic revolution" in various countries, and so forth. The most thorough and detailed examination of the background of all of these events can be found in the works of S. L. Agayev, the renowned Soviet expert on Iranian affairs who has published three major monographs and a number of articles in recent years on the Iranian revolution and the Islamic Republic of Iran, which took the place of the Pahlavi monarchy.

In the book "Iran v proshlom i nastoyashchem," which has already been praised by reviewers as a thorough methodological study (although it is written in a popular-science style),¹ the sections examining the causes and preconditions of the Iranian revolution are of special interest. The author analyzed the main results of the so-called "white revolution" or "revolution of the shah and the people"--that is, the socioeconomic and political reforms of 1963-1977, immediately preceding the revolution of 1978-1979. S. L. Agayev seeks and finds the answer to the question of why the attempted acceleration of capitalist modernization, actually unprecedented in the history of the developing Asian and African countries, evoked a stormy reaction from traditional structures, in the deadlock caused by Iran's preceding socioeconomic development and in the intense maturation of the internal contradictions characteristic of capitalist evolution throughout the Asian and African world. In his opinion, the deep-seated cause of the revolution "consisted of the glaring discrepancy between modern and traditional sectors, the relative socioeconomic incompatibility and quite definite lack of sociopolitical integration of their characteristic socioeconomic practices" (p 255). The distinctive features of mass public opinion are also discussed at length and are attributed to the specific balance, definite singularity and even unique interaction of traditional and modern elements in the country's socioeconomic evolution.

This multifaceted analysis serves as the basis for an examination of the complexity and contradictions, rare in world revolutionary practice, of the Iranian revolution's internal structure. The most significant statements and conclusions in the book² seem quite convincing both from the standpoint of theoretical methodology and from the standpoint of their reinforcement with facts, which gives the book the nature of a comprehensive study, the results of which will undoubtedly be of considerable value in future scientific investigations. The main complaint about the book is the author's insufficient examination of the activities of such anti-shah forces as the Iranian People's Fedayeen partisan organization, the Organization of People's Mojahedin, the People's Party of Iran (Tudeh) and other parties and groups actively opposing (sometimes with weapons in hand) the shah's regime and playing an important role in the revolutionary movement of the late 1970's.

The second of S. L. Agayev's monographs we are reviewing, a work subtitled "444 Days in Captivity," is an examination of Iranian-American relations after the revolution of 1978-1979. Here the author analyzes the causes of the United States' loss of influence in Iran and some other Muslim countries, examines the real motives of the Iranian Shiite leaders who sanctioned the seizure of the American embassy and reveals the nature of U.S. anti-Iranian and other actions in the international arena during the period of the hostage

crisis. He also discusses the position taken by the United Nations and by various states in connection with the Iranian Islamic authorities' obvious violations of the universal standards of international law pertaining to the inviolability of diplomatic personnel and in connection with the danger that the heavy concentration of U.S. naval forces in the Persian Gulf could start a world conflict. The book also contains a discussion of a large group of problems in Iran's domestic political development between the end of 1979 and the beginning of 1981.

When the author decided to reveal the vagaries and underlying causes of this extremely complex international conflict, he chose an exceptionally interesting narrative form. It is not only that what we find here is something like a political detective story. In addition, the narration of events in the book skillfully imitates the style and line of reasoning of all of the main protagonists in the conflict, the development of which is described in their own words--from the language of "commercial considerations" to the medieval religious rhetoric characteristic of the arguments cited to back up the claims of the conflicting sides. Completely justifiable and completely transparent irony, setting off all of the seriousness of the problems lying behind the conflict, including the issue of international security, is organically woven into the fabric of the narrative and secures the absolute omnipotence of the narrator. Epigrams carefully chosen for each chapter clearly and concisely reflect the essence of the events or the opinions and intentions of their participants. Both the format and the style of the book aid, on the one hand, in clearly underscoring the adventurism, incongruity and absurdity of the action of seizing the embassy, an action incompatible with international law, and, on the other, in revealing the ways in which the Islamic leaders used the seizure they had sanctioned and the entire wave of anti-American feeling in Iran in general, reflecting the anti-imperialist thrust of the revolution, to strengthen their own position and their own authority.

The author provides an almost exhaustive general assessment of the clergy's program. He calls it "anti-Western and traditionalist in its basic aims, Islamic-integrationist in its political content and petty bourgeois-populist in its social outlook" (p 23). He reveals some of the tactics the clergy used to isolate political opponents and reach the levers of governmental power. To retain this power, the religious leaders made every effort to divert the attention of the masses from social problems and they then used the Iran-Iraq war, which began in September 1980 (and is still going on), for the same purpose.

In essence, each side in the conflict, as the author conclusively demonstrates, used it to solve its own domestic political problems: In the United States Carter was striving to hold on to the presidency for a second term, and in Iran Khomeini and his supporters were striving to consolidate their power. Taking advantage of the entire hostage situation, including the threats of American sanctions, to speculate on anti-American feelings in the country, the Islamic leaders, led by Khomeini, gained the ratification of the constitution they wanted, the election of Bani-Sadr, a man close to Islamic circles, as the first president of the new republic, and the establishment of their own supporters in the Majlis with the aim of securing the necessary majority for the clerics.

A large part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the policy of the American administration headed by President Carter and the position taken by representatives of American big business. The absorbing narrative shows the reader the logical connection between each of Carter's statements and decisions before and during the election campaign in the United States and the statements and actions of the Iranian regime. The description of the Carter Administration's tragicomic attempt to free the hostages by landing American troops in Iran in April 1980 is just as fascinating.

The evolution of U.S. military policy and the U.S. move toward the unprecedented escalation of the arms race, using the "Iranian crisis" as one of the pretexts for this, the growth of the U.S. military budget and the buildup of American naval forces in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf are described quite vividly. The author cites numerous cases in which the United States pressured its West European allies and Japan to force them to support the anti-Iranian sanctions (pp 92-93 et passim) and simultaneously attach them more closely to its militarist chariot. The author takes pains to show how the U.S. administration used the "Iranian crisis" to undermine the development of American-Soviet relations and the policy of international detente in general (pp 95-96).

The discussion of such a great variety of topics in the book removes it from the narrow confines of an academic study of Iranian affairs and, by virtue of its generic stylistics, gives it the nature of a lively and entertaining narrative, touching upon the most diverse aspects of sociopolitical life in today's world, especially pertinent matters connected with ethics and morality in international politics. The chief editor of the book, Professor R. A. Ulyanovskiy, wrote the following in the foreword: "Its documented facts and journalistic format will give a broad range of readers an understanding of the social psychology of the popular masses in the developing countries, modern methods of mobilizing the masses and manipulating mass public opinion, the workings of 'big politics' in the exploitative society, its ethics and moral values and, by the same token, the greatness of the ideals of peace, democracy and social progress, ideals dear to the hearts of all Soviet people" (p 15).

Some of the statements the author makes, however, are objectionable. We cannot agree that the Muslim student organization which seized the U.S. embassy in line with the wishes of Imam Khomeini represented an independent "power center." There is good reason to believe that it acted on the orders of Khomeini, for whom the apparent existence of several Islamic "power centers" was convenient at that time because it gave him a chance to maneuver and thereby attain his goals. The independence of Iranian foreign ministers A. Bani-Sadr (later the first president of the republic) and, in particular, S. Qotbzadeh, mentioned by the author, was actually just as relative.

In the book "Iran: rozhdeniye respubliki," the last of the three monographs by S. L. Agayev under examination in this review, the author pays special attention to Iran's domestic political development after the overthrow of the shah's regime in February 1979, tracing the Shiite clergy's rise to power, step by step.

Since many Western researchers and the functionaries of the Islamic Republic of Iran often compare the Iranian "Islamic revolution"³ directly to the great French bourgeois revolution of the late 18th century, the author also resorts to this kind of comparison, using it for two purposes: both as a literary device to give the reader an extremely eloquent sense of the common features of different eras, and as a special method of employing comparative-historical research procedures, leading the reader to consider some of the distinctive features of the Iranian revolution, fundamentally distinguishing it from other bourgeois revolutions. As the author of the foreword, Professor R. A. Ulyanovskiy (who was also the chief editor), correctly notes, "the validity of this use of the ideals and images of the French revolution, personifying the radical type of general democratic revolution, was substantiated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism, who constantly cited it as a historical example" (p 15). Furthermore, the author of the book himself makes the stipulation that "seeking similarities between the two revolutions on the surface is a futile pursuit. Especially since any historical comparison is meaningful primarily within the bounds of contrast" (p 25).

The approach the author chose in his explanation of these events combines a keen journalistic historical narrative with the consideration of important philosophical, moral, ethical and historical-sociological issues. In this context, the following issues are of special interest: the real and illusory aims of the revolution; contemporary modifications of the Thermidorean resurgence; the "price" of revolution; "Dantonism" and "Robespierrism" as sociopolitical phenomena, etc. The theoretical issues raised in the book could therefore be useful in the study of other revolutionary processes of the present day.

The book is also interesting because of the numerous descriptive portraits giving the reader a keener sense and more thorough understanding of these events. For example, there is a portrait of the Ayatollah Khomeini. In S. L. Agayev's extremely lifelike depiction, this is an outstanding personality, far transcending the bounds of the stereotypical ignorant medieval fanatic often described in the foreign press. He is also a consistent ideologist of the Shiite clergy and a singleminded and shrewd politician, "filled with profound faith in the divine predestination of his assigned mission" (p 27). There are also eloquent portraits of other leaders of the anti-shah opposition and participants in the Iranian revolution, including the ideological and political opponents of Khomeini during the period after the revolution, when his desire to monopolize power became increasingly apparent. The reader will find an entire gallery of images of political figures in the Islamic Republic of Iran--Mehdi Bazargan, Shapur Bakhtiar, Ibragim Yazdi, Sadeq Qotbzadeh and Abol Hasan Bani-Sadr--and many members of the top Shiite clergy--Mahmud Talegani, Mohammad Bekheshti, Hosein Montazeri and many others. Unfortunately, the description of leftist parties and organizations is far less vivid. It is true that the author tries to fill this gap with a thorough examination of the status and activities of leftist forces in the Islamic Republic of Iran in a separate article.⁴

Along with S. L. Agayev's previous monograph, the book "Iran: rozhdeniye respubliki" contains a preliminary summarization of the results of the Shiite

clergy's struggle for power and for the creation of an Islamic republic headed by clerics. The two books are almost the only studies of present-day Iran of this kind, in which events are analyzed literally day by day, and sometimes hour by hour.⁵ Obviously, this certainly does not eliminate the need for the thorough and careful study of the complex and multifaceted aspects of the Iranian revolution, study which can only be the result of the lengthy and detailed examination of each aspect by a broad range of scholars--historians, economists, sociologists, philosophers and others. But it was precisely the need for this kind of study that required the initial summarization of the vast quantities of accumulated factual information and at least some extremely general answers to the theoretical questions raised in this connection. S. L. Agayev's performance of this massive and necessary job will aid considerably in the further scientific analysis of the Iranian revolution.

S. L. Agayev's academic works of recent years, representing a unique but organic combination of profound theoretical-methodological analysis of the processes in question with a memorable narrative style, uncommonly lively for an academic publication, are a new and brilliant development in this field of Oriental studies and in the field of general history studying the revolutionary processes of the present day.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, the review by V. I. Maksimenko (NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, 1982, No 6, pp 163-168), and the article by V. I. Ilyushenko, "The Causes and Distinctive Features of the Iranian Revolution," RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR, 1983, No 1, and others.
2. They were summarized by the author in a separate article: S. L. Agayev, "The Sociopolitical Prerequisites for the Fall of the Monarchy in Iran," in the book "Rabochiy klass v mirе revolyutsionnom protsesse" [The Working Class in the World Revolutionary Process], Moscow, 1981.
3. For a discussion of the accuracy of the term "Islamic revolution" and its interpretation by various political forces in the Muslim countries, in the West and in Marxist literature, see S. L. Agayev, "The Concept and Essence of 'Islamic Revolution,'" AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, 1984, No 5.
4. S. L. Agayev, "Leftist Forces and the Islamic Regime in Present-Day Iran (1979-1983)," in the book "Revolyutsionnaya demokratiya i kommunisty Vostoka" [Revolutionary Democracy and Communists in the East], Moscow, 1984.
5. There is another book containing the same kind of scrupulous examination of the events of a specific period--the 40 days of national struggle in January and February 1979 that culminated in the overthrow of the shah's regime: A. B. Reznikov, "Iran: padeniye shakhskogo rezhima" [Iran: The Fall of the Shah's Regime], Moscow, 1983 (see the review by I. M. Tatarovskaya, "The Causes and Nature of the Iranian Revolution," RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR, 1984, No 1).

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

MONOGRAPH ON SPANISH, PORTUGUESE SOCIALIST PARTIES REVIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 2, Mar-Apr 86 (signed to press 12 Mar 86) pp 187-190

[Review by V. M. Yakushchik of book "Sotsialisticheskiye partii Ispanii i Portugali (1973-1979). Opyt sravnitel'nogo analiza" [The Socialist Parties of Spain and Portugal (1973-1979). Experimental Comparative Analysis] by I. V. Danilevich, Moscow, Nauka, 1984, 257 pages]

[Text] Since the middle of the 1970's the development of domestic political processes in Spain and Portugal has been influenced considerably (but far from equally) by the socialist parties of these countries. Furthermore, the reversals of the rapid and sometimes headlong evolution of social reformism on the Iberian Peninsula clearly reflect the struggle between various currents of contemporary social democracy and changes in the balance of power within its ranks. Despite all of the significant distinctive features the two parties reveal--in contrast to other national and regional detachments of social democracy--in their ideological-theoretical aims and practices, a critical analysis of their theories and policies provides valuable information for an understanding of domestic political processes in Spain and Portugal and of the general national trends in the ideological and political evolution of international social democracy.

Until recently, however, the history of the social-reformist movement in these states had not been examined sufficiently in scientific literature. This book by I. V. Danilevich is the first study dealing specifically with the history, ideology and policy of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) and the Portuguese Socialist Party (PS) in the contemporary era.¹ The book under review can justifiably be regarded as a logical continuation and conclusion of three previous works by the author.² Concentrating primarily on the period stipulated in the title of the book, which was decisive in the history of both parties (and of both countries), the author nevertheless traces the main stages in the preceding 100-year history of the social democrats of the Iberian Peninsula; he also analyzes the most important aspects of the present status of the social-reformist movement in the region. The PS and PSOE are among the oldest social-democratic parties (founded respectively in 1875 and 1879) and are also the youngest of the European social-reformist parties, I. V. Danilevich says, because they were "revived at the beginning of the 1970's after the interval of several decades resulting from the rule of fascist dictators" (p 8).

The main common feature of the PS and PSOE during the initial stage (before the 1930's) was the prevalence of rightwing opportunist tendencies in these parties, just as in the majority of the parties of the Second International. The role of the two parties in the labor movement of these countries and in their political affairs in general differed, however. The PS, which had virtually no influence in the Portuguese labor movement (it was dominated by anarchist-syndicalists in the early 20th century), was essentially only an appendage of the bourgeois republican parties, and when the military dictatorship was established in 1926 and gradually turned into a fascist regime, the party disappeared almost without a trace (it was officially disbanded in 1933). In Spain, on the other hand, the PSOE was a significant factor in politics and played an important but contradictory role in the revolution of 1931-1939. After the establishment of Franco's fascist regime, it formally retained its organizational structure, in contrast to the PS, and operated mainly in exile.

Prior to the late 1960's and early 1970's, as the author correctly points out, a common feature of the social-reformist movement in Spain (that is, of the PSOE) and Portugal (that is, of the small and short-lived groups of Portuguese supporters of "democratic socialism" that sprang up from time to time) was its domination by rightwing elements and its lack of any kind of significant contact with the masses.

The 25th and 26th PSOE congresses (called the 12th and 13th "congresses in exile": August 1972 and October 1974) and the constituent congress of the PS (April 1973)³ marked the victory of leftist currents in the Iberian Peninsula's social-reformist movement. The PSOE and PS armed themselves ideologically with the leftist socialist concept of "self-governing socialism" and renounced the more odious anticommunist slogans characteristic of rightwing social democrats. This line of the new generation of social-reformist leaders in Spain and Portugal (on whom the Socialist International also relied) is justifiably described in the monograph as a result of the discerning reinterpretation of the history of social reformism, as evidence of the realization of the futility of the rightwing social-democratic line under the conditions of the increasingly severe crisis of the fascist dictatorships, and of the desire to take the changes in the international situation into account, and also as an attempt to gain a stronger position in the competition with communist parties for influence in the working class and the opposition movement. "The Socialist International and its leading parties," I. V. Danilevich notes, "supported groups in Portugal and Spain which were not the closest to them in the ideological sense, but were the most promising, in their opinion, for the further development of political processes in these countries in directions benefiting them" (p 60). The policy of international social democrats with regard to Spain and Portugal produced results, and the statement that the "leaders of the Socialist International thereby made and conducted a sufficiently farsighted policy" (p 60) seems completely valid.

The author cogently reveals the fairly complex forms of PS and PSOE activity during the process of the democratic reforms in Portugal and Spain after the collapse of the fascist regimes. When the Spanish regime gradually turned into a bourgeois-democratic government after 1976, the policy of the PSOE was

quite consistent, in line with traditional social-reformist patterns. The advancement of ambitious strategic goals was combined with a moderate program of sequential reforms and the practice of constant compromise.

The assessment of the policy of the PS, with its dramatic reversals during the period of the Portuguese revolution of 1974-1976, is a more difficult matter. The situation of that time, which was distinguished by the sharp acceleration of revolutionary reforms in spring 1975 and the further radicalization of the Armed Forces Movement (MFA), which controlled all of the main links of government, forced the PS to advance slogans transcending the bounds of the actual aims of social-reformist leaders, so that later, as the author comments, the Socialists "had great trouble explaining their policy of spring 1975" (p 94). By summer 1975 the PS had to face the threat of the complete collapse of the social-reformist "schemes." The favorable outcome of the constituent assembly election, however, gave the Socialists new strength. It was then that the party leaders launched a fierce anticommunist campaign and openly opposed the policy line of the MFA. Social reformism again (as it had countless times in the past) called itself the "last anchor for the salvation of the entire bourgeois...economy."⁴ The author also discusses the support the PS received from international social democracy and imperialist groups in its efforts to squeeze the Portuguese revolution into the narrow channel of bourgeois-democratic reforms.

In addition to revealing the objectively counterrevolutionary nature of PS policy in 1975, the author also discusses some positive aspects of party activity. After the revolutionary wing of the MFA was defeated at the end of November that same year, and not without the active assistance of the Socialist leaders, there was another leftward shift in PS policy and it aided in the consolidation of democratic institutions and the elimination of the danger of a reactionary dictatorship. I. V. Danilevich aptly reveals the dual nature of the activities of Portuguese social reformists, stemming from the typical desire of members of this political current to take a position "midway" between the two main antagonistic classes and from the utopian aim of creating "pure" democratic institutions, serving the interests of all strata of the bourgeois society simultaneously.

We must object, however, to the author's remark that "at the decisive moment, it (the PS--V. Ya.)...was able to resist both leftist and rightist extremism" (p 112). After all, the social reformists' relationship with ultra-leftists was less a matter of resistance than of the use of their adventurist behavior as a pretext for a struggle against consistently revolutionary forces, especially the PCP [Portuguese Communist Party] and members of the armed forces with the closest ties to it.

The PS and PSOE also played a significant role in the drafting of the progressive constitutions of Portugal (1976) and Spain (1978), "the adoption of which marked the end of the transitional stages in the political development of Spain and Portugal from fascist dictatorship to bourgeois democracy" (p 168). The author correctly notes that when the new constitutions went into effect, "the conditions of PS and PSOE operations became much more similar" (p 169)--the two parties subsequently operated under the conditions of bourgeois

parliamentary democracy. Nevertheless, there were also some significant differences. For example, although the political reforms in Spain were slow and were controlled by bourgeois-reformist forces, they constantly moved upward and promoted the continued consolidation of the position of laborers and democratic forces. In Portugal, on the other hand, political development in general took a downward path. The new Socialist government in summer 1976 marked the beginning of a series of attacks on the democratic gains of the laboring public and the purposeful destruction of revolutionary achievements, such as nationalization, agrarian reform, worker control at enterprises and the democratic rights of laborers.

"The PS and PSOE entered the new phase of their development with different kinds of political baggage and on different levels of evolution. By that time the PS had already embarked on the path of 'moderacy' and had already traveled quite far in this direction. The PSOE, on the other hand, had not yet begun the open revision of its leftist socialist position" (p 170). The rightist policy the PS pursued at the height of the revolution in 1975 left its traces. First of all, it was easier for social-reformist leaders now, during the new stage, to renounce the political aims and slogans which they had been forced to advance in the atmosphere of revolutionary enthusiasm and which "transcended the bounds of their objective class position and social goals" (p 72). Secondly, the views of the majority of party leaders, who were frightened by the scales and speed of revolutionary reforms, underwent a perceptible rightward shift. Thirdly, the political balance of power within the PS changed--rifts and purges considerably weakened the left wing of the party. Finally, and fourthly, a rigid bureaucratic structure took shape within the PS, "with the upper levels dictating the policy line and, in principle, conducting it with absolute authority" (p 35), and with rank-and-file party members virtually unable to influence party policy to any considerable extent. The force of inertia prevented changes in political theory for some time. Leftist socialist slogans were still being used in 1976 (pp 173-174). The rightward evolution of theoretical policy aims, however, was quite rapid. The rightward shift in the official ideology of Portuguese social reformism was supposed to serve as a means of ideologically substantiating and justifying the rightist PS policy.

The PSOE, as I. V. Danilevich demonstrates in his book, is now displaying the same tendency as the PS toward greater "moderacy" in policy aims. However, although the PSOE right wing controls the party system along with the centrists, it has not achieved the complete renunciation of leftist socialist program objectives, whereas the PS made the final break with all of the remaining traces of the "radical" aims recorded in the 1974 "Declaration of PSP Principles" at its congress in September and October 1983. In Portugal, social reformism has moved as far to the right as possible without becoming bourgeois reformism. In this connection, PCP Secretary General A. Cunhal stressed that the ideological basis of the PS "is now not even reformism, but a concept of state-monopolist capitalism corresponding to a policy of counterrevolution under Portuguese conditions."⁵

Whereas the PSOE, despite the bourgeois limitations of its policy, which became particularly distinct as soon as it became the ruling party in December 1982,

is still a democratic party and a component of Spain's leftist forces, in Portugal the constant alliances forged by PS leaders with rightwing forces have objectively taken the Socialist Party out of the group of leftist democratic forces. "Who could view the PS as a party standing between the Right and the PCP...now that the PS has spent the last few years forming coalitions and concluding agreements with the PSD [Social Democratic Party] and other reactionary forces with primitive anticommunist aims?" A. Cunhal asked. "We criticize the PS not because it is socialist, but because it has ceased to be such, and because it discarded first socialism and then democracy."⁶

At its 11th (special) congress in February 1986, before the second round of the presidential elections, the Portuguese Communist Party appealed to the laboring public to vote for former PS leader (still its "spiritual guide") M. Soares, although he was considered to be the "candidate of rightwing forces."⁷ This was made necessary when the scattered votes of supporters of leftist forces kept all leftist candidates (F. S. Zenha and M. L. Pintasilga) out of the second round. Furthermore, this was the only correct move because it would prevent the election of reactionary Freitas do Amaral as head of state and secure the election of M. Soares. "Reaction," O DIARIO commented in this connection, "suffered its most crushing defeat since the victory of the April Revolution in 1974."⁸

At the same time, the crushing defeat the PS suffered in the parliamentary elections of 6 October 1985, which dealt a severe blow to the right wing of the social-reformist movement in Portugal, and the severe rift in the camp of Portuguese supporters of "democratic socialism," whose loyalties were divided during the 1986 presidential elections between candidates M. Soares and F. S. Zenha (the "second-in-command" in the PS until 1983), were noteworthy events and positive ones for the country's leftist forces. After all, whereas the existence of the social-reformist ideology and the social-reformist movement is a historically determined and inevitable phenomenon in Portugal (and any other capitalist country) because it has a fairly broad social base, the domination of the social-reformist movement in Portugal by the right wing is not an inevitability. The revival of the leftist socialist (or at least "moderate-socialist") movement in the country, in the opinion of Portuguese Communists, would be of great importance in its progressive development. The possibility of this kind of revival is not confined to the mere possibility of a leftward shift in the PS itself (which would be quite difficult at the present time). It can be seen clearly in the continued clarification of the ideological position of a recently created organization--the Party of Democratic Renewal, which has attracted many Socialists and which was supported by more than 18 percent of the voters in the 1985 parliamentary elections.

The final chapter of the monograph contains a detailed discussion of PS and PSOE foreign policy. The author focuses attention on the "Europeanist" tendencies in the activities of these parties--the intensification of the processes by which Spain and Portugal are being drawn into the EEC. The attitude of the socialists toward the NATO bloc is also discussed at length: The author reveals the openly pro-NATO policy of the rightwing PS leadership and the quite different policy conducted by PSOE leaders until 1983, a policy of "distance" from NATO. The author shows how the PSOE's present renunciation of

its anti-NATO position has led to the further convergence of the foreign policy views and international policies of PS and PSOE leaders (pp 250-251).

In general, the book under review is a thorough study and an extremely valuable one, both by virtue of the factual material it presents and summarizes and by virtue of the theoretical conclusions it contains. It will make an important contribution to the scientific examination of the ideology and policy of contemporary social democracy. The few inaccurate facts and poorly substantiated or edited statements in the work do not detract from the high assessment of the monograph as a whole.

FOOTNOTES

1. There is only work in Soviet literature dealing specifically with the history of the PSOE: S. P. Pozharskaya, "Sotsialisticheskaya rabochaya partiya Ispanii. 1931-1939" [The Spanish Socialist Workers' Party. 1931-1939], Moscow, 1966.
2. This is a reference to the chapters by I. V. Danilevich in collective works. The titles of these chapters are: "Spain: Social Reformism at a Crossroads," "Portugal: The Reformist Parties and the Revolution" and "Portugal and Spain: The Limits and Possibilities of Iberian Social Reformism" (see, respectively, "Sotsial-demokraticheskiy i burzhuaznyy reformizm v sisteme gosudarstvenno-monopolisticheskogo kapitalizma" [Social-Democratic and Bourgeois Reformism in the System of State-Monopolist Capitalism], Moscow, 1980, pp 135-161, 193-227; "Razmezhevaniya i sdvigi v sotsial-reformizme. Kriticheskiy analiz levyykh techeniy v zapadnoyevropeyskoy sotsial-demokratii" [Shifts and Changes in Social Reformism. Critical Analysis of Leftist Currents in West European Social Democracy], Moscow, 1983, pp 115-167).
3. The congress date cited on page 29 of the book (May 1973) requires clarification. It was announced for the purpose of secrecy. In fact, the congress was held in the FRG with the aid of the SPD on 19 April 1973 (see PORTUGAL SOCIALISTA, 1977, No 120, p 9).
4. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 36, p 217.
5. AVANTE!, 14 March 1985, p 4.
6. AVANTE!/SEMANA, 13 September 1985, p 4.
7. AVANTE!/DOSSIER, 6 February 1986, p 8.
8. O DIARIO, 17 February 1986.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1986

8588

CSO: 1807/287

- END -